

TERENCE

HECYRA

EDITED BY SANDER M. GOLDBERG

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge

PHILIP HARDIE

*Senior Research Fellow, Trinity College, and Honorary Professor of Latin,
University of Cambridge*

RICHARD HUNTER

Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

Kennedy Professor Emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge

S. P. OAKLEY

Kennedy Professor of Latin, University of Cambridge

TERENCE

HECYRA

EDITED BY
SANDER M. GOLDBERG



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521721660

© Cambridge University Press 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United Kingdom by CPI Group Ltd, Croydon CRO 4YY

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Terence.

Hecyra / edited by Sander M. Goldberg.

pages cm. – (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-0-521-89692-4 (hardback)

1. Mothers-in-law – Drama. 2. Terence – Criticism and interpretation. 3. Latin drama (Comedy) – History and criticism. I. Goldberg, Sander M. II. Title.

PA6756.H6G65 2013

872'.01 – dc23 2013007966

ISBN 978-0-521-89692-4 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-72166-0 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	ix
Introduction	i
1. Comedy at Rome	i
2. The career of Terence	10
3. The <i>Hecyra</i>	15
4. Language and style	25
5. Metre	32
6. Donatus	40
7. Text	43
P. TERENTI AFRI HECYRA	49
Commentary	84
<i>Appendix I: Philumena's pregnancy</i>	203
<i>Appendix II: Greek analogues</i>	205
<i>Works cited</i>	209
<i>Index</i>	221

PREFACE

The act of reading connects a drama, a lyric, a novel, and a psychological or political treatise, and when we read drama, we treat it the same way we would any other literary text intended for reading, and we demand, first of all, to be satisfied as readers. But the very act of reading a drama is directed toward a goal different from that of reading lyrics or novels. Drama is written to be played on a stage, and as a literary form it functions only if it offers the possibility of performance.

(Hristić 1972: 348)

When Ovid, shivering to death on the Black Sea, sent his third book of *Tristia* back to Rome, he knew that the physical object leaving his hands would from the beginning help shape the public's experience of his work. Terence's *Hecyra* was not from the outset a text in that sense. It was first a script created for a very different type of performance.¹ As a play, its meaning was not established by the author's words alone or by a partnership limited to author and audience. There were significant intermediaries. Actors, director, and composer all contributed to the final product, and in the rough-and-tumble of Roman festivals, what happened on the stage was never entirely sheltered from whatever else was happening in the vicinity. Nor was any one performance necessarily *the* performance or any one version of the script necessarily *the* script. Our modern text of Terence is therefore both more and less than it seems, not simply a book but not in itself an altogether reliable record of the play Roman audiences knew. One thing is nevertheless clear: as the written remains of dramatic performance, it invites different interpretive strategies from those designed for more familiar objects of academic attention. It thus makes additional demands on a commentary. Grammar and syntax, vocabulary and metre, textual transmission and textual criticism are as much the commentator's business as ever, but understanding a dramatic text requires more than simply reading it accurately. We must not only grasp what its characters say, but consider how they look, how they sound, and what they do. All that requires imagination, and while the results of that imaginative process may be less amenable to absolute demonstration than philologists might wish, ignoring questions of performance, refusing to frame hypotheses about how a scene was (or could be) played, certainly misrepresents the significance of the surviving text and the dramatic art to which it is a witness. Performance-based criticism, though hardly the only valid approach to Roman comedy, reveals aspects of the

¹ Contrast what we know about the role of books and reading in Roman literary culture (Hutchinson 2008: 20–41, Parker 2009) with what seems to have been the early status of performance scripts (Deufert 2002: 18–29, Goldberg 2004, Marshall 2006: 274–9).

dramatist's art likely to pass unnoticed in more traditional styles of criticism.² This commentary keeps performance in mind throughout, and even at its most philological never entirely forgets the specific idiosyncrasies of performance in second-century Rome and their role in shaping the text before us.

The present work began taking serious shape through a commentators' workshop on Latin poetry directed by S. Douglas Olson and Alex Sens at Georgetown University in 2008. I am grateful to the directors and participants in that workshop for providing such a productively gruelling experience. Special thanks are due to Brent Vine and Tim Moore for critiquing early drafts of the entire commentary and to their students at UCLA and the University of Texas at Austin, who took those drafts as their guide and freely told me what they thought of them. As did, with his customary acumen and tact, my editor for this series, Philip Hardie. Various sections of the Introduction were read in whole or part by John Barsby, Peter Brown, Bob Kaster, and Brent Vine, who proved indefatigable in catching errors and more than once saved me from myself. What errors, infelicities, and errant flights of fancy remain are entirely my own responsibility. There are also the inevitable debts to predecessors. Aelius Donatus, to whom we all owe so much, gets his due throughout, but I have been less assiduous in crediting more recent colleagues. I nevertheless learned much from consulting the editions of *Hecyra* by T. F. Carney and Stanley Ireland and acknowledge with pleasure and thanks my debt to them.

² Then again, a performance-based criticism is unlikely to note the 'responsions', i.e. scenes corresponding in length and theme, noted in the text by Kruschwitz 2001 (none in *Hec.*) or to attribute the same thematic significance to the repetitions of *Hec.* as Sharrock 2009: 242–9. In imagining ancient theatre practice, it must also slip between the Scylla of anachronism and Charybdis of naive historicism noted by Taplin 1978: 172–81.

ABBREVIATIONS

Barsby	J. Barsby, ed. <i>Terence</i> , 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: 2001
GLK	H. Keil, ed. <i>Grammatici latini</i> , 8 vols. Leipzig: 1857–70
NLS	E. C. Woodcock, <i>A new Latin syntax</i> , Cambridge, MA: 1959
OLD	P. G. W. Glare, ed. <i>Oxford Latin dictionary</i> , Oxford: 1982
PCG	R. Kassel and C. Austin, eds. <i>Poetae comici graeci</i> , vol. II: Agathenor – Aristonymus, Berlin: 1991; vol. VI.2: Menander: Testimonia et fragmenta apud scriptores servata, Berlin: 1998
SEL	C. E. Bennet, <i>Syntax of early Latin</i> , 2 vols. Boston: 1910, 1914

INTRODUCTION

1. COMEDY AT ROME

In 240 BCE, following their victory over Carthage in the First Punic War, the Romans expanded a traditional autumn celebration honouring Jupiter, the *ludi Romani*, into an international festival in the Greek style. Since that meant, among other things, adding formal dramatic productions to the scheduled entertainments, the Senate commissioned a Greek from Tarentum named Andronicus to produce a tragedy and a comedy in Latin for the occasion.¹ The experiment proved so successful that by the early second century plays of various kinds had become regular features at three additional festivals, the *ludi plebei* (November), *Apollinares* (July), and *Megalenses* (April), and also began appearing on the bill at votive games, triumphs, and the more elaborate aristocratic funerals. Plays were created on Greek topics and Roman ones, ranging from the serious to the comic, from myth to history to the foibles of daily life, and whether by accident or design, their growing popularity made them a significant medium for popularizing Roman traditions and fostering Roman civic identity.² Yet of the many different types of play performed on these occasions, only Latin comedies performed in Greek dress, the so-called *comoedia palliata*, survive in more than fragments, and of the two hundred or so plays written for the *palliata* stage in the third and second centuries by a dozen or more different playwrights, only the six of Terence and twenty by Plautus survive intact.³ The history of this *palliata* comedy is well treated elsewhere and requires no repetition here,⁴ but three

¹ The tradition regarding this initiative in 240 BCE is reasonably sound: Cic. *Brut.* 72–3, *Sen.* 50, *Tusc.* 1.3, Gell. 17.21.42–3. See Gruen 1990: 80–92, Bernstein: 1998: 234–51. Its significance, however, is far less certain. Though Varro saw in Andronicus' scripts the true beginning of Latin literature, his predecessors Accius and Porcius Licinus championed rival narratives based on rival chronologies (Welsh 2011). Nor is the history of stage entertainment (*ludi scaenici*) before Andronicus at all clear, e.g. Oakley 1998: 40–72 on the notoriously problematic excursus at Liv. 7.2. See the extensive bibliography in Suerbaum 2002: 51–7, and for a good summary of the problem, Manuwald 2011: 30–40.

² The classic study of the performance schedule is Taylor 1937. Duckworth 1952: 76–9 is also helpful. For drama's role in the formation of civic identity, see Wiseman 1995: 129–41, 1998: 1–16, controversial in detail but surely correct in outline.

³ Ribbeck 1898: 388–90 provides a list. Gell. 3.3.11 reports that in his day (second century CE) 130 plays still circulated under the name Plautus, though Varro had identified only twenty-one as indisputably authentic. These (including the fragmentary *Vidularia*) are probably the ones that survive. Much less is known of the plays on Roman themes in Roman dress, the so-called *praeetextae* and *togatae*. See Wiseman 2008, and for full discussion of the Republican genres, Manuwald 2011: 129–86.

⁴ Gratwick 1982 provides an excellent, brief introduction; a full account is provided by Manuwald 2011. Duckworth 1952 and Hunter 1985 remain valuable. Manuwald 2010 offers a rich assortment of ancient testimonia.

overarching factors in our understanding of Roman comedy do merit special attention because of their particular bearing on the study of *Hecyra*.

1.1. *Conditions of performance*

Large-scale formal support for drama, the kind of institutional support found in the Greek world, was alien to the Roman experience. There was no equivalent in Republican Rome to the Athenians' heavy public investment in theatrical entertainment, which included a formal civic mechanism for selecting plays and funding productions, and an increasingly elaborate permanent home for them in the precinct of Dionysus. Occasions like the Greater Dionysia soon became high points of the liturgical and civic calendar: immense prestige attached to the dramatic competitions at Athens, which even in the fifth century could turn producers, playwrights, and actors into celebrities.⁵ In later times, itinerant professional companies performed their own versions of Athenian plays throughout the Hellenistic world. These companies also enjoyed considerable, though less political, prestige and enjoyed the use of elaborate public facilities in the cities they visited.⁶ The comparative informality of the corresponding Roman arrangements is thus especially striking. Though the Senate authorized the staging of plays and made a financial contribution to their production, it persistently refused to sanction construction of a permanent theatre in the city. Arrangements were left largely to the discretion and personal resources of the junior magistrates responsible for the games, who would contract for a temporary stage to be built on each occasion before the temple of the god being honoured. Limited seating may have been provided immediately before that stage in the area that Greek theatres reserved for choral performances, but most spectators would have had to find their own places on or around the temple or in the adjacent area.⁷ Roman actors, instead of performing in an enclosed structure that by its very nature

⁵ Pericles, e.g., first attracted notice as *choregos*, backing productions of Aeschylus that included *Persians*. Sophocles held several important offices, including election as *strategos* at the time of the Samian crisis of 441/o. By 449 BCE there were separate prizes for actors. Dramatists and actors were commonly citizens in the fifth century, and their talents tended to run in families (Sutton 1987). *Choregoi* at the Dionysia were also citizens; the fact that metics might serve at the Lenaia may reflect the secondary status of that festival (Wilson 2000: 27–32, 51–7).

⁶ On the Greek dramatic festivals, see Goldhill 1997 and Rehm 2007, and for the later acting troupes, Lightfoot 2002. Documentary evidence for all these issues is available in Csapo and Slater 1995: 103–206, 239–55.

⁷ This is most clearly the arrangement at the Megalensia, where the space on the Palatine hill before the temple of the Magna Mater was especially restricted (Goldberg 1998). See more generally Marshall 2006: 31–56, Sear 2006: 54–7, Manuwald 2011: 55–68, and for the temporary stages themselves, Beacham 2007. The first set of plays performed at Augustus' *Ludi Saeculares* in 17 BCE deliberately recalled the archaic style by being offered *in scaena quoi theatrum adiectum non fuit nullis positis sedilibus* (CIL VI.32323 = ILS 5050, lines 100–1). Cf. the tradition dimly recalled by Tac., *si uetustiora repetas, stantem populum spectauisse* (Ann. 14.20).

committed actors and spectators to the shared endeavour of creating a play, therefore had to work much harder to attract and hold the attention of their audiences, who were subject to distraction by rival entertainments in the vicinity or by the discomforts of whatever vantage points they had secured. This is the material fact behind T.'s complaint in the *Hecyra* prologues of performances disrupted by the prospect of acrobats and gladiators (Introduction 3.1).

The improvisational quality of the Roman venues had further consequences. The need to erect a new stage for each occasion necessarily limited rehearsal time on site, with an especially narrow window in the case of the Megalensia, since the aediles did not assume office until mid-March and the festival was held at the beginning of April. The resulting time constraints may have encouraged what became some of Roman comedy's most striking features, e.g. its passion for stock scenes and routines, its opportunities for improvisation, and the occasional traces in our texts of places to expand or shorten, elaborate or simplify performances as time and circumstances required.⁸ Such flexibility was facilitated by the high degree of professionalism that characterized Roman drama from the time the Senate first charged Andronicus with the task of producing plays. How he created those first scripts in Latin and recruited actors capable of performing them are among the many mysteries of early Roman theatrical history, but it is clear that by the end of the third century a community of actors and writers was officially established at Rome as a professional guild under the patronage of Minerva.⁹ Contracts for producing plays were awarded to these companies of professional actors, not to individual playwrights, and the heads of the companies assumed responsibility for the success of the shows.

This at least is the role that T.'s impresario, Ambivius Turpio, claims for himself in the prologues to *Hauton timorumenos* and *Hecyra*.¹⁰ Turpio was a *senex* by the 160s and speaks to T.'s audiences with the authority of age: he identifies himself as the young playwright's patron (*Hec.* 52 in *tutelam meam*), as he had been a generation earlier for the great Caecilius (*Hec.* 14–15). A curious anecdote about Turpio in rehearsal tells us a little more about their partnership. Turpio, says Don., played the parasite Phormio while yawning, tipsy, and scratching his ear, and T., though initially annoyed by the actor's apparent inebriation, eventually had to admit that this insouciance was exactly what he had imagined for the

⁸ Plautine texts sometimes contain 'doublets' that may represent alternative ways to play a scene, e.g. with more or less elaborate music (Goldberg 2004), or may preserve the remains of successive variations (Jocelyn 1995). For the role of stock scenes and improvisations, see the essays in Benz et al. 1995 and Marshall 2006: 260–79.

⁹ Festus 333M, though the details of this so-called *Collegium poetarum* are debated. See Jory 1970, Horsfall 1976, Gruen 1990: 87–90. The theatrical community at Rome consisted largely of freedmen and slaves.

¹⁰ Turpio of course speaks the words and plays the part T. wrote for him, but the part is at least consistent with other testimony regarding Roman actor-managers. See Duckworth 1952: 73–6, Beare 1964: 164–70, Leppin 1992: 49–59, Lebek 1996, Brown 2002, Goldberg 2005: 72–3, and for the importance of the company (*grex*), Marshall 2006: 83–94.

character.¹¹ The playwright's active engagement in the rehearsal is as striking as the actor's condition. Turpio's company produced all six of T.'s plays, and the scripts may well have been tailored to the capabilities of the troupe. That kind of customization has long been suspected for Plautus: among the more obvious signs of a similar process in the Terentian corpus is the variety of musical effects in the recitatives, which may reflect the special talents of Turpio's resident musician, Flaccus.¹² The contributions of people like Turpio and Flaccus remind us that success on the Roman stage required considerably more than just a good script.

1.2. *The audience*

The improvisational quality of Roman venues also facilitated contact, or at least the illusion of contact, between actors and audience. The inevitable commotion as a play gets under way is evoked in various Plautine prologues, such as this moment in *Poenulus*.¹³

scortum exoletum ne quis in proscaenio
sedeat, neu lictor uerbum aut uirgae muttiant,
neu dissignator praeter os obambulet
neu sessum ducat, dum histrio in scaena siet.

(17–20)

Let's have no worn out tart sitting on the
stage or lictor bandying words or rods waving
or an usher getting in someone's face or
seating anyone while an actor is on the stage.

At *Captivi* 10–14, the prologue-speaker interrupts his own exposition to single out an individual in the crowd for abuse, confirming in the process how indistinct the boundaries of improvised theatrical space can be.

¹¹ Don. ad *Ph.* 315 *quibus auditis exclamauit poeta se talem eum scriberet cogitasse parasitum*. What few details of original performance survived the six centuries between T. and Don. probably entered the scholarly tradition through Varro. The comment on Ambivius' acting style at Cic. *Sen.* 48 may simply be Cicero's own experience of Roscius projected back on an earlier generation.

¹² Flaccus is credited in the didascaliae with the music for each of the six plays, a striking distinction. For T.'s metrical innovations, see Moore 2007, 2012: 182–4. Cf. Fraenkel 2007 (1960): 416, 'In general one must never forget that a writer like Plautus, who wrote all his comedies for performance by a particular company on a particular occasion, had to take account of the aptitudes of the actors who composed the troupe.' Gilula 1989: 104–5 makes a similar point about T. Similarly, the Shakespearean corpus reflects the changing strengths over time of the Chamberlains' and King's Men and the different requirements of the (outdoor) Globe and (indoor) Blackfriars. See Shapiro 2010: 228–31, 245–51.

¹³ Pl. *Poen.* 17–20, though all of 1–45 contributes to the picture. Additional vignettes of the Roman audience appear at *Am.* 64–95 and *As.* 4–5. For the more problematic evidence of the *Heeyra* prologues, see Introduction 3.1.

iam hoc tenetis? optumest.
 negat hercle illic ultumus. accedito.
 si non ubi sedeas locus est, est ubi ambules,
 quando histrionem cogis mendicariet.
 ego me tua caussa, ne erres, non rupturus sum.

Have you got this then? Great.
 That man far in the back says no. Come forward.
 If there's no place to sit, take a hike,
 since you're forcing an actor into beggary.
 I'm not about to rupture myself for you, so you don't miss anything.

Still more striking is a similar interaction *during* the performance, as Euclio in *Aulularia* desperately seeks to recover his stolen treasure.¹⁴

obsecro uos ego, mi auxilio,
 oro, obtestor, sitis et hominem demonstretis, quis eam abstulerit.
 quid est? quid ridetis? noui omnes, scio fures esse hic complures,
 qui uestitu et creta occultant sese atque sedent quasi sint frugi.
 quid ais tu? tibi credere certum est, nam esse bonum ex uolto cognosco.
 hem, nemo habet horum? occidisti. dic igitur, quis habet? nescis?

Please help me, all of you!
 I beg, I implore you to point out the man who took it.
 What's that? You laugh? I know you all. I know there are plenty of thieves here,
 who disguise themselves in fancy clothes and sit as if they were honest.
 What do you say? I'll surely believe you, since I can tell from your face you're
 upright.
 What? None of these has it? You've ruined me. Tell me, who has it? You don't
 know?

His first, sweeping appeal seems generic, but the switch to the singular at 719 (*quid ais tu?*) means that Euclio has singled out an individual, and the follow-up (*hem . . . ?*) means he waits for a response and does not immediately let go of his victim. Seating that brought spectators close to the stage platform would have facilitated such immediacy, allowing actors to acknowledge and perhaps even to mingle with them in the course of the performance, especially if the action spilled beyond the confines of the *scaena*.¹⁵ Though T. does nothing quite this bold in

¹⁴ Pl. *Aul.* 715–20. Direct address to the audience in Greek comedy tends to be more generic. See the examples in Bain 1977: 190–4. Dionysus' appeal to his priest at Ar. *Ra.* 297 is a closer, though more fleeting, parallel.

¹⁵ The so-called phryx vases of southern Italy, e.g. the Cheiron vase and New York Goose Play (figs. 12.6 and 10.2 in Taplin 1993), often show action in what would notionally be the audience's space, and while this material predates the *palliata* by as much as two centuries, it is hard to imagine Roman producers ignoring such easy opportunities to enrich their action.

Hecyra, the play is replete with monologues that give its characters, especially its women, opportunities to reach out to spectators and arouse their sympathy (e.g. 274–80n.).

Euclio's address is also striking because those men in their sparkling outfits (*uestitu et creta*) may have included members of the senatorial elite: after 194 BCE, senators in attendance at the shows could claim special places for themselves that later practice suggests were immediately before the stage.¹⁶ If Euclio's jibe reflects the widespread resentment this new privilege generated, it may also suggest greater licence for social comment than is often envisioned in Roman contexts. The fact that senators could claim this right does not necessarily mean, of course, that they ever attended in large numbers or that the shows were staged primarily for their benefit: other sources allude to women, children, slaves and the urban poor among the crowd.¹⁷ What united them all was their passion for *palliata* comedy. The very strength of the tradition and the enthusiasm with which dramatists embraced and exploited its conventions suggest an audience well versed in its devices and deeply appreciative of its effects. Thus John Wright, after documenting the enduring appeal of its traditionality, concludes: 'Widely travelled (many would have seen some of the best Greek theater of the day during military service in Sicily and South Italy), self-confident, sophisticated, thoroughly accustomed, thanks to their experiences in forum, court, and comitium, to every facet of artistic verbal ritual, the Romans clearly made up one of the great theatrical audiences of all time.'¹⁸ The details are probably exaggerated: not all were widely travelled or could claim active experience of forum, court, and comitium, but a significant majority surely knew what they wanted and insisted upon getting it. And they were almost certainly demonstrative in making known their pleasure or disappointment. Notoriously animated in Cicero's day, there is no reason to think Roman audiences were any more restrained a century earlier.¹⁹

¹⁶ So Cic. *Har. resp.* 24 *ante populi consessum senatui locum*. Liv. 34.44 and 54, Val. Max. 2.4.3, Ascon. 70C are less specific. The motives and effects of this development remain unclear, though the resentment it aroused is well attested. See Gruen 1992: 202–5, Gilula 1996. The joke at *Capt.* 15–16 expands to acknowledge wealthier spectators, though not necessarily senators, in their seats. On the whole vexed question of seating by class, see Rawson 1987, and for Roman seating more generally, Moore 1995, Beare 1964: 241–7. The practice is easier to envision – and would have been easier to enforce – in the formal theatres of later times than at the temporary venues of the second century.

¹⁷ Beare 1964: 173–5 assembles the evidence. The arguments of Fontaine 2010: 183–7 for a predominately aristocratic audience are not convincing. The portrait in Richlin 2005: 21–30 is more credible. See also Chalmers 1965, Marshall 2006: 79–81, Manuwald 2011: 98–108.

¹⁸ Wright 1974: 191. So too Chalmers 1965, Moore 1998: 8–23. The old stereotype of the obtuse Roman audience, e.g. Norwood 1923: 2 'the immense majority of Romans did not appreciate good art', has largely vanished from scholarship.

¹⁹ Cic. often notes the animation of audiences for both tragedies and comedies, e.g. *Amic.* 40, *Parad.* 3.26, *Q. Rosc.* 30, and with a specifically political turn, *Att.* 2.19.3, *Sest.* 118–23. Greek audiences were famously demonstrative in all periods: Csapo and Slater 1995: 301–5.

1.3. *Greek models*

Roman dramatists did not create *palliata* scripts out of nothing: their characters, plots, and settings all originated in the New Comedy of fourth- and third-century Athens. Our authors freely, even proudly admit as much.

Clerumenoe uocatur haec comoedia
 graece. latine Sortientes. Diphilus
 hanc graece scripsit, postid rursum denuo
 latine Plautus cum latranti nomine.

(Pl. *Cas.* 31–4)

This comedy is called *Clerumenoi*
 in Greek, in Latin *The Lottery Players*. Diphilus
 wrote it in Greek; the eventual Latin remake
 was done by Plautus, of the barking name.

graece haec uocatur Emporos Philemonis,
 eadem latine Mercator Macci Titi.

(Pl. *Merc.* 9–10)

This play of Philemon is called *Emporos* in Greek,
 the Latin version is *The Merchant* of Titus Maccius.

adporto nouam
 Epidicazomenon quam uocant comoediam
 Graeci, Latini Phormionem nominant.

(T. *Ph.* 24–6)

I bring you a new
Epidicazomenos, as Greeks call this
 comedy. Latin-speakers name it *Phormio*.

Fidelity to these models, however, was not a priority. Simply preserving the original Greek dress and settings for characters who then proceeded to speak and act like Romans inevitably turned Athenian comedies of daily life into Roman domestic fantasies. Plautus went even further. His musical extravaganzas may owe nearly as much to native Italian traditions of stage entertainment as to what he found in Diphilus or Menander, and he sometimes stretched his models well beyond the point of recognition.²⁰ T's more restrained style of adaptation created plays that are easier to reconcile with scholarly preconceptions

²⁰ At *Cas.* 60–6, 1012–14, Pl. proudly claims responsibility for what must have been a significant change in the action and emphasis of the original, and *Epid.* has been so radically reworked that the contours of its putative model have long defied recognition (Fantham 1981). On the general problem of 'models', see Manuwald 2011: 282–92. Fraenkel 2007: 275–86 on how Pl. 'dismembered' Greek drama remains basic.

about Greek comic art (Introduction 2), but the difference between the two dramatists does not obviate a central issue in all discussions of Roman comedy: What counts as 'original' or 'creative' in a tradition so shamelessly derived from another?

That question has a long, problematic history in the study of Roman comedy. By the late nineteenth century, scholars, anxious to see through the Latin plays to the lost Greek ones behind them, were not always kind to the Roman authors whose techniques of adaptation often obscured their view. Even the great Friedrich Leo, a particularly astute and appreciative reader of Plautus, treated him as a stepping-stone to something else.²¹ The subsequent rediscovery of much original New Comedy, which began in earnest with publication of the Cairo codex of Menander in 1907 and continues to the present day, has gradually relieved this pressure on the Latin texts. Hellenists with genuine New Comedy to read increasingly leave the Latin 'copies' to Latinists and allow the Roman plays to stand on their own merits. Pl.'s reputation has risen accordingly. His passion for the stock characters and situations of the *palliata*, his mastery of lyric rhythms (rivalled only by Horace nearly two centuries later), and the easy rapport he established with his audience evoke widespread admiration: we have learned to judge his achievement not by how well he escapes, but by how brilliantly he exploits his traditional material.²² With Roman stage practice now a legitimate focus of attention in its own right, the question that so preoccupied Fraenkel's generation, 'How did Plautus translate?', no longer seems so pressing. As Erich Segal noted at the very start of this shift in the scholarly paradigm, 'once the play begins, everything becomes "Plautus"'.²³

T. nevertheless speaks of rendering a scene from Diphilus 'word for word' (*Ad. 11 uerbum de uerbo expressum extulit*), a suggestion of fidelity only strengthened by the ancient exegetical tradition, which occasionally encourages direct comparison with the Greek models. Don., for example, in commenting on *Hecyra's* opening, *per pol quam paucos reperias meretricibus | fidelis euenire amatores*, *Syra* (58–9), quotes the corresponding lines of the original by Apollodorus to reveal what any modern reckoning would call an act of translation:

²¹ So in the words of his student Fraenkel 2007 (1922): 2, 'Leo loved Plautus, but he loved Greek comedy even more, and if he could gain access to the Greek forms through the Roman plays, this gave him complete satisfaction, and sometimes he did not go any further.' See Goldberg 1986: 61–6, Halporn 1993: 191–6, and Goldberg 2011: 206–10.

²² This is the great lesson of Wright 1974: 195–6. Few today would agree with Norwood 1923: 1 that Pl. 'wrote like a blacksmith mending a watch'.

²³ Segal 1987: 6. On the earlier question, cf. Fraenkel 2007: 3–4 and the new Preface to the English edition, xi–xxii. By 1960, Fraenkel had acknowledged the futility of reconstructing lost originals: 'Perhaps it will be necessary to make do, more often than Leo, Jachmann, and I did, with the finding that the course of the action which we find in Plautus could not have been the same in a Greek comedy, and it will be necessary to give up the attempt to reconstruct the action or essential elements of the action of lost Greek plays' (416).

ὀλίγαις ἑραστῆς γέγον' ἑταίραισιν, Σύρα, | βέβαιος ('A steadfast lover, Syra, comes to few hetairai').²⁴ Fidelity on this verbal level, however, is regularly eclipsed by more radical changes. Eliminating an expository prologue, interpolating scenes or characters from a second play, turning dialogue to monologue (or monologue to dialogue), and eliminating act divisions inevitably produce significant alterations in the way a play works on its audience. In the one case where an extant Roman play can now be set against a continuous fragment of its original, Pl.'s *Bacchides* and Menander's *Dis exapaton*, attention to how Pl. adjusted his model to Roman dramatic practice takes us deeper into his creative process than the way he turned Greek words into Latin ones.²⁵ Setting a Latin play against its 'model' reveals only part, and not necessarily the most important part, of a very complex creative process, especially when, as in the case of T., independent knowledge of those models is quite limited (Barsby 2002). If what we really care about is a *Roman* comedy, why should we pay more than token attention to the fact that it was based on a Greek one?

Modern scholarship has increasingly responded to the fact of models by assimilating them, whether known directly or indirectly, into the larger body of 'intertexts' that comprise the literary milieu in which Roman dramatists operated. This approach, which engages not exclusively with dramatic texts but encourages us to extend our analysis to the influence of oratory, polemic, and even to Callimachean poetics, vastly enriches the field of scholarly inquiry while avoiding the old pitfalls of a source criticism too inclined to fault Roman comedy for not being Greek comedy.²⁶ Its potential weakness is that in privileging a meditative, text-based style of analysis, it brushes aside the possibility that scripts created for second-century theatre audiences, who favoured broad strokes, immediate effects, and rapid pace, might require different critical methods from texts created for private enjoyment.²⁷ A more traditional alternative draws analogues and parallels from the Greek material without necessarily positing

²⁴ Don. ad loc., a line he almost certainly derived from one of his scholarly sources (Introduction 6). Such literalism is not unique to T. The correspondence of what is now Men. fr. 111 K-T ὃν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος to Pl. *Bac.* 816–17 *quem di diligunt | adulescens moritur* helped Ritschl 1845: 406 identify *Dis exapaton* as Pl.'s model.

²⁵ The papyrus, officially published in 1997 as P. Oxy. 4407, has been known and discussed since 1968. See Handley 2001, and for its relation to Roman dramatic style, Goldberg 1990. The structural comparison is unique in the record, though an extended stylistic comparison is also provided by Gell. 2.23, setting Caecilius' *Plocium* against its Menandrian model. See Wright 1974: 120–6.

²⁶ For these 'intertexts', Sharrock 2009: 75–83, and as applied to *Eu.*, 219–32. The possibility of allusions to Callimachus in Roman drama, still highly controversial, is well argued by Sharrock, less well by Fontaine 2010: 197–200. A more narrowly constructed intertextuality is discussed by Manuwald 2011: 309–20.

²⁷ Sharrock 2009: 79 n. 140 observes in response that 'it is worth remembering that dramatic works also have a textual life outside the performance', though whether second-century scripts enjoyed any 'textual life' among contemporaries is uncertain. It is not even clear that whole scripts existed, much less circulated outside the troupes in the dramatists' lifetime. See Deufert 2002: 44–57, Goldberg 2005: 48–50.

direct relationships as sources or targets of allusion. This can make the critic's task a little easier. Where Athenian audiences, for example, would very likely have recognized an allusion to Euripides' *Electra* in the entrance of Knemon's daughter to fetch water from her well and Diphilus probably parodied such tragic scenes with a water jar in the original of *Rudens*, Romans watching the antics of Pl.'s Scepharnio and Ampelisca were less surely attuned to the full range of their scene's dramatic antecedents.²⁸ By recognizing the tradition's capabilities, which is what parallels represent, we can appreciate the choices Pl. made in writing the scene as he did (and not in some other, equally possible way) without needing first to reconstruct specifically what he found in Diphilus or to consider whether his audience had a comparable grasp of the tradition's history.²⁹ This approach is especially helpful in the case of *Hecyra*, whose immediate Greek source material is extremely problematic, but where the tradition is comparatively rich in analogues.³⁰

2. THE CAREER OF TERENCE

Nothing is known for certain about the life of T., although much was said about it in antiquity. A biography ascribed to Suetonius records that P. Terentius Afer was born at Carthage, came to Rome as the slave of an (otherwise unknown) senator named Terentius Lucanus, and secured his freedom by virtue of intellectual talent and dark good looks. His dramatic career, which consisted of six comedies produced in the course of the 160s, was supported by his great predecessor Caecilius Statius and by leading Romans like Scipio Aemilianus and Gaius Laelius. Then, still in his mid-twenties, he drowned in a shipwreck on his way back from Greece with a fresh collection of Greek plays adapted for the Roman stage, leaving behind a small estate on the Appian Way and sufficient money for his daughter to marry an equestrian. In spinning this tale, Suetonius cites numerous authorities, who all disagree with one another. As so often with literary biography in antiquity, the author's life has largely been deduced – and embellished – from the author's work. Not even a birth at Carthage and early death at sea are necessarily true: Afer 'the African' is not a cognomen restricted to those of North African origin, and the fatal trip to Greece may simply be deduced from

²⁸ Men. *Dys.* 189–217, Pl. *Rud.* 331–457. The correspondences and 'intertexts' of these two scenes are approached in interestingly different ways by Handley 2002: 106–16 and Fontaine 2010: 42–9.

²⁹ Though effect and intention are not the same, dramatists certainly produced the former and began with the latter, and while authorial intention need not be the sole object of critical inquiry, it remains a legitimate one. See Hinds 1998: 47–51.

³⁰ The source-problem for *Hec.* was defined by Schadowaldt 1931, but the reconstruction by Kuiper 1938 is not credible. Lefèvre 1999 is better, but vaguer. For the play's Greek analogues, see Appendix II. Though Greek material claims historical priority, later parallels can be useful for revealing how different dramatists responded to similar opportunities and challenges. See Goldberg 1986: 161–2, Lefèvre 1999: 15–28.

the undeniable fact of the small corpus and too literal an interpretation of T.'s complaint (*Eu.* 41–3) about the limited amount of material at his disposal.³¹

The only real sources of knowledge about T. and his career are, in addition to the surviving texts themselves, additional details preserved by Don. in the course of elucidating them and production notes, the so-called 'didascaliae', included with the MSS.³² Happily, that is not nothing. As we have seen, T.'s association throughout the 160s was apparently with a single company of actors led by an old professional named Ambivius Turpio, the same impresario who produced plays for Caecilius a generation before. There are also hints of aristocratic patronage, not just in his own public acknowledgement of support from anonymous *homines nobiles* (*Ad.* 15–21), but from the fact that *Hecyra* and *Adelphoe* were produced at the funeral games for Aemilius Paullus arranged by his sons, Fabius Maximus and Scipio Aemilianus. That information derives from the didascaliae, which record sufficient details of the original productions to reconstruct a likely chronology for T.'s career.³³ The plays, occasions, and dates seem to be these:

<i>Andria</i>	at the Ludi Megalenses of 166 BCE
<i>Hecyra</i>	at the Ludi Megalenses of 165 BCE (aborted)
<i>Hauton timorumenos</i>	at the Ludi Megalenses of 163 BCE
<i>Eunuchus</i>	at the Ludi Megalenses of 161 BCE
<i>Phormio</i>	at the Ludi Romani of 161 BCE
<i>Hecyra</i>	at the funeral games of Aemilius Paullus in 160 BCE (aborted)
<i>Adelphoe</i>	at the funeral games of Aemilius Paullus in 160 BCE
<i>Hecyra</i>	at the Ludi Romani of 160 BCE

Since plays by the early second century were regularly commissioned for four of Rome's great festivals, the apparent predilection for the Megalensia is perhaps significant: T. (or his producer) may have found it an easier venue to manage, smaller in size and scale than the others.³⁴ It is also clear that T.'s taste ran toward the New Comedy style of Menander, since four of the six plays are based

³¹ Though T.'s name certainly suggests a freedman from Africa, it is worth recalling that Quint.'s teacher, the famous orator and consul Cn. Domitius Afer, was neither a freedman nor an African. The ancient life is preserved in MSS of Don. Text and commentary are provided by Rostagni 1954 and Carney 1963: 5–17; for critical explication see Beare 1942, Courtney 1993: 87–90, Fantham 2004.

³² For what the didascaliae are (and are not), see Klose 1966, Goldberg 2005: 69–75, and the Commentary ad loc. The antiquarian research of Varro and his teacher Aelius Stilo is thought to stand behind the information recorded by later sources like Suet. and Don. (Schmidt 1989).

³³ The attack on the accuracy of the didascalical record by Mattingly 1959 rests on too credulous a reading of the highly rhetorical prologues, as does the largely political interpretation of T.'s career by Umbrico 2010: 59–111.

³⁴ The space available on the Palatine was physically smaller than venues for the other games, and since the mid-Republican calendar, significantly out of rhythm with the sun, put 'April' in mid-winter, the weather might also have reduced attendance. See Goldberg 1998.

on Menandrian originals and the other two, *Phormio* and *Hecyra*, are based on plays by Apollodorus of Carystos, whose own style of play-making is sometimes said to have been modelled on Menander's.³⁵

That interest in the character-driven comedy of Menander ultimately distinguishes T.'s plays from those of Pl., whose comedies tend to be louder and broader in their effects even when, as in *Amphitruo* and *Aulularia*, character not only drives the plot, but is a major centre of dramatic interest. T. seems in comparison quieter and more thoughtful, and, given the Romans' growing experience and deepening appreciation of Hellenism in this period (a cultural awareness especially clear in a figure like Aemilius Paullus), it has long been common to imagine T. as standing somehow apart from the other authors of *palliatae*, a playwright more interested in giving Romans a close Latin equivalent of what Greek art had achieved than feeding them more of the old Roman comic stereotypes. The polemical prologues he created to introduce his plays encourage this idea by suggesting the ongoing struggle of a young innovator against older rivals eager to sabotage his efforts (e.g. *An.* 5–7, *Ad.* 1–5) while ridiculing the absurdities of their own cliché-ridden stage devices (*Hau.* 30–4, *Eu.* 35–40, *Ph.* 6–12).³⁶ That view has not been altogether good for T.'s reputation. His admirers, even at their most lyrical, hasten to acknowledge a certain limitation of vision. So, for example, the famous Italian philosopher-critic Benedetto Croce: 'In the plays of Terence there is a unity of feeling, a steady and coherent personality, an artistic chastity and nobility, a shyness about leaving his own range and breaking or straying into those of others.'³⁷ On the other side stands a whole school of criticism so impressed by the semblance of Atticism in T. that they mistake it for the real thing: 'Terence found in the Attic comedies such a completely formed tradition of the well-made play that he knew his own attempts could not, as a rule, compete with it. As long as this reservoir was not exhausted, it probably seemed to him pointless to offer necessarily weaker creations of his own . . . Where he found occasion to alter his models with inventions of his own, the result was normally not an essentially new creation.'³⁸ T.'s very artistry then deprives him of art.

Scholars of all persuasions really ought to have known better. The prologues are not accurate witnesses to anything except T.'s gift for literary invention. Deeply rhetorical, and thus inevitably artificial, they are no more reliable in their testimony than the *parabaseis* of Old Comedy, to which they have been reasonably

³⁵ What little is known about Apollodorus is gathered at *PCG* II. 485–6. Belief in a close association of Apollodorus and Menander, a modern idea, is encouraged by the thematic similarity of Menander's *Epitrepontes* and *Hecyra*, and thus presumably with the Apollodorean *Hecyra* that was T.'s model.

³⁶ So Wright 1974: 183–5 imagines T. struggling against the monopoly of the contemporary *Collegium poetarum*, though the prologues also cite the example of Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius (all safely dead) to justify his own practice (*An.* 18–21, *Hau.* 20–1).

³⁷ Croce 1966 (1936): 784–5. So too Norwood 1923: 3–4, 'these six works show a serious failing . . . That is to say, his subject matter is amazingly limited.'

³⁸ Ludwig 1968: 180–1. The German approach shaping Ludwig's judgment is surveyed by Gaiser 1972. See in particular his comparison of Pl. and T. at 1107–9.

compared. Having stripped them of any overt expository function – itself a bold move reflecting confidence in his plays’ ability to introduce their own action – T. turns the prologues into a new kind of entertainment to do the traditional work of winning the audience’s attention and fuelling their interest in the play to come.³⁹ The character created for this purpose, the old theatrical hand wise in the ways of plays and audiences, is not, strictly speaking, T.’s producer Ambivius Turpio, but Turpio playing a part (*orator . . . ornatu prologi*, *Hec.* 9, cf. *Hau.* 1–2). Given such explicit role-playing, not even the fact of a quarrel with contemporary dramatists is entirely certain, much less the aesthetic grounds for it.⁴⁰ As a practical matter, it is hard to believe that T., with the unwavering support of a leading impresario and the sympathy of influential aristocrats to guarantee his contracts, was in any meaningful sense an outsider, nor did he ever deny exploiting Roman comic conventions or claim any greater fidelity to his models than his predecessors showed. Friedrich Leo, at the very beginning of modern scholarly interest in T., noticed the artificiality of his Atticism: he was no mere translator and no truer to his models than Pl. was. He simply altered them in a different way.⁴¹

The truth of that insight is clear on inspection. Though mocking dramatic convention in his prologues, T. does not abandon it. He certainly hints at the absurdity of a stock device when he ridicules a rival:

qui nuper fecit seruo currenti in uia
descesse populum: quor insano seruiat?

(*Hau.* 31–2)

who recently had a crowd yield to a running slave
in the street: why indulge a madman?

Yet the running slave, so intent on delivering his message that he fails to see the person he seeks and so exhausted by his efforts that he is unable to speak when contact is eventually made, was a great favourite of the Roman stage, and T. makes full use of him. There are four running-slave routines in his six plays, perhaps none more brilliantly effective than that of the overwrought Geta in

³⁹ The move is not entirely unprecedented. Pl. *Cur.* and *Epid.*, e.g., lack prologues entirely, though these may possibly have been lost in the course of transmission. *As.* has a minimal prologue, and that of *Trin.* introduces themes rather than details of plot. Expository prologues are delayed in *Cist.* and *Mil.* Fuller discussion in Duckworth 1952: 211–18, Hunter 1985: 24–35, Moore 1998: 12–17.

⁴⁰ *Ph.* 12–17 may itself hint at the artificiality of the quarrel. The rhetorical nature of the prologues, first noted by Leo 1913: 251–2, is explored in detail by Goldberg 1986: 31–60. For their antecedents, see Bianco 1962: 31–43, Arnott 1985, and for their place in the history of dramatic polemic, Lada-Richards 2004. The uniformly combative tone running through all seven of them suggests the same speaker throughout, though Turpio is only identified twice. Young men, says T. (*Hau.* 2) normally played these parts, but the generalization may not apply to his own practice.

⁴¹ Leo 1913: 246–7, ‘One readily feels that T. is simpler, clearer, and more Attic than Pl. It is not the case, however, that he on principle translated more faithfully; we have observed that he handled his models as freely in his own way as Pl. did. It is because he developed his own art, in which, as was the case with Pl., he reveals his own nature.’

Adelphoe, who actually wishes to find people in his way and acts out in frenzied mime what he would do upon meeting them.⁴² T. may also invert the familiar routine to equally great comic effect: *Hecyra* contains one of two such inversions as the slave Parmeno is sent off on a fool's errand, from which he eventually returns exhausted and frustrated.⁴³

Stock characters of the sort T. dismisses (*Hau.* 37–9) also appear to great effect in his own plays. There is a greedy pimp in *Adelphoe*, a soldier and parasite in *Eunuchus*, and *Hauton timorumenos* and *Phormio* present formidable wives able to hold their own against even the magnificent Cleostrata of Pl.'s *Casina* or Menaechmus' ferocious wife in Epidamnus. Yet here, too, T. is especially good at inverting roles: the clever Dauos of *Andria* succeeds in his scheme only because the tale he spins turns out to be true, and in *Hecyra*, Parmeno, initially so proud of his abilities, is eventually left confused and uncertain about what, if anything, he has achieved for his young master. The humour for T., as for Pl., works most effectively by embracing convention, not denying it. Audiences get their best laughs precisely because they come to the play with expectations and see those expectations brilliantly realized or ingeniously overturned. And finally, it is important to remember that T.'s passion for rhythmic variation even within scenes is very much in the Roman musical tradition and not, so far as we know, in the Greek one.⁴⁴

The significant differences in tone between Pl. and T. should not obscure the fundamental fact that, with one notorious exception, T.'s plays had no difficulty finding and keeping audiences. Indeed, *Eunuchus* was so popular it garnered an immediate encore and a record fee (Suet. *Vita* 3), and even after T.'s death, his plays almost certainly remained in the active repertory through at least the 140s. That was how *Andria* acquired an alternative ending and why the didascaliae sometimes present a jumble of names and occasions.⁴⁵ The one apparent exception is *Hecyra*.

⁴² *Ad.* 299–329, with other variants on the type at *An.* 338–51, *Ph.* 179–99, 841–60. See Duckworth 1936, Brown 2007: 183, Lowe 2009. The *currens* was such a stage favourite that he left his mark on the material record with pictures and figurines reflecting the characteristic mannerisms of his routine, the many Greek illustrations strengthening claims of a Greek origin for this familiar Roman figure (Csapo 1989, 1993).

⁴³ *Hec.* 430–43, 799–815. Demea is sent on a comparably futile errand at *Ad.* 570–86, 713–18.

⁴⁴ Moore 2007. T.'s *tibicen* Flaccus, who probably both composed and played the score, is mentioned by name in every didascalia, a likely sign of his importance to the company.

⁴⁵ The didascalia to *Ph.* in the Bembine codex (A) garbles names that may be the consuls of 106 BCE (so Tansey 2001), which would be the last attested production of T., though a similar set of consuls appears in the *fasti* for 141. The reference in Var. *R.* 2.11.11 to the *senex* of *Hau.* wearing a leather smock is not unequivocal evidence that Var. saw the play in performance: his context is standard rustic dress, and the other example cited (Caecilius' *Hypobolimaetus*) was certainly best known as a book (cf. Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 46). Don. knew but recognized as spurious a final scene of *An.*, written in acceptable *palliata* style, that resolved a few loose ends. It is included in the OCT, omitted by the Loeb. For T.'s popularity in his time, see Parker 1996.

3. THE *HECYRA*3.1. *Hecyra*: Stage history

Hecyra was performed successfully in 160, almost certainly at the *ludi Romani*, but by then it was a play with a history. In the dramatist's own words on that occasion,

Hecyram ad uos refero, quam mihi per silentium
numquam agere licitumst: ita eam oppressit calamitas.
(29–30)

I bring you *Hecyra*, which I was never allowed to perform
in peace: to such a degree did misfortune overwhelm it.

Two earlier failures are described in two surviving prologues. The first failure, at the *ludi Megalenses* of 165, is thus recalled twice. The first account of that first failure was written some five years after the event, when T. offered the play for a second time at the funeral games in 160 honouring Aemilius Paullus, the conqueror of Macedonia.

haec quom datast
noua, nouom interuenit uitium et calamitas
ut neque spectari neque cognosci potuerit:
ita populu' studio stupidus in funambulo
animum occuparat.

(1–5)

When this play was offered
as new, an unforeseen flaw and misfortune intervened,
so it could be neither seen nor appreciated:
the crowd, dumb with desire, was completely preoccupied
with a tightrope walker.

This second performance, however, was also aborted. The prologue T. wrote for a third, ultimately successful attempt later that same year therefore recalls both the original failure in 165,

quom primum eam agere coepi, pugilum gloria
(funambuli eodem accessit exspectatio),
comitum conuentu', strepitu', clamor mulierum
fecere ut ante tempus exirem foras.

(33–6)

When I first began to perform it, talk of boxers
(desire for a tightrope-walker there set in),
a crowd of supporters, a commotion, women's cries
arose, so I had to make a premature exit.

and what turned out to be a fiasco at Paullus' funeral:

primo actu placeo; quom interea rumor uenit
datum iri gladiatores, populu' conuolat.
tumultuantur clamant pugnans de loco:
ego interea meum non potui tutari locum.

(39–42)

The beginning went well. Then, when a report came
that gladiators would perform, a crowd gathered.

There was tumult, shouting, fighting for places:

I could not keep my place through all that.

What went wrong? Roman crowds could certainly be difficult, and failure was not unique to *Hecyra*. Caecilius, we are told, did not always enjoy immediate success (14–15), and the reference at *Phormio* 32–3 to an earlier failure by Turpio's company is not necessarily an allusion to *Hecyra*. The problem might have been with the play itself: an audience grown impatient with its refusal to reveal its secret until late in the action could perhaps have grown restless and inattentive.⁴⁶ Yet that is not the story T. tells. Efforts to pin the play's failure on its own audiences, who preferred tightrope walkers, boxers, and gladiators to the subtleties of a Terentian comedy, were exploded by the eventual recognition that *populus conuolat* at line 40 can only mean 'a crowd gathered', i.e. a second crowd arrived, whose demand for places disrupted a performance in progress.⁴⁷ T. leaves the distinct impression that on two quite separate occasions performances of *Hecyra* suffered a nearly identical *calamitas* for nearly identical reasons. That coincidence, when taken together with the prologues' overtly rhetorical nature, has increasingly aroused a deeper suspicion: today, not simply the sequence but the very historicity of the events he describes are in question.⁴⁸

Yet whatever their literal truth, the prologues could only hope to succeed in their appeal if their story were credible to Roman audiences. They should therefore provide at least general evidence for the conditions under which plays were performed in the second century, and so it seems to be. Imagine that cramped space on the Palatine before the temple of the Magna Mater, and it is easy to understand why the audience of 165 could have been distracted by a tightrope walker within view or by the prospect of

⁴⁶ So Goldberg 1986: 166–9, noting that *Adelphoe*, which shared the bill at Paullus' funeral, does not appear to have encountered any such difficulty. See also Introduction 3.2.4.

⁴⁷ Gilula 1981 and Sandbach 1982, though the old view endures even in Conte 1994: 94, 'in 160, everyone left when, right in the middle of the performance, word went around that a show of gladiators was starting just then'.

⁴⁸ Most notably, though in different ways and for different reasons, by Gruen 1992: 210–18 and Sharrock 2009: 246–9. Gowers 2004: 160–1 implies a similar doubt.

boxers.⁴⁹ Conditions would hardly have been better at the funeral in 160, though the setting was different. Gladiatorial contests took place in the forum together with the other attractions of an aristocratic funeral, and the facilities for these events were again largely improvised.⁵⁰ In T.'s day, temples and basilicas around the forum accommodated spectators: theatrical shows needed only a stage for the actors, while gladiators would require simply a layer of sand on the ground and a barrier to define the space for combat and keep the crowd at a safe distance.⁵¹

Seating was not the only *ad hoc* element. The programme, too, was variable. Unlike the regularly scheduled *ludi scaenici*, whose official status put magistrates in charge and mixed religious and civic functions on an established basis, funeral *munera* were private and reflected the capabilities and resources of the sponsoring family.⁵² They were not of fixed length, nor were gladiators a necessary feature. Polybius' famous description of the Roman funeral includes the procession (*pompa*) and eulogy (*laudatio*) and digresses on the role of ancestral *imagines*, but he describes no other attendant spectacles. The gladiators he mentions later in the context of Paullus' funeral are important to his narrative precisely because they were an optional expense, not a requirement of the occasion.⁵³ Most funerals were too small to attract historical notice.⁵⁴ That spectators drawn to the funeral

⁴⁹ For boxers by the stage, cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.185–6. There is no indication, *pace* Parker 1996: 594–5, that in the case of *Hecyra*, the *populus* intent on these activities at the Megalensia was any other than the crowd already gathered for the play.

⁵⁰ Formal amphitheatres for combat sports were a product of later times, *pace* Welch 2007: 30–8. Vit. 5.1–2 is explicit about the use of existing buildings to provide vantage points for shows in the forum. Early attempts to erect grandstands there were unsuccessful precisely because they obstructed the traditional viewing places: Plut. *C. Gracch.* 12.4, Wiseman 2009: 157–64. See also Jory 1986: 537–8.

⁵¹ Cf. Millar 1998: 147, 'It was a crucially important characteristic of Roman public life that a wide variety of events took place, on no clearly regulated timetable, in the same physical space, the Forum. . . . To convert the Forum for a gladiatorial *munus*, all that was needed was to line it with barriers, *cancelli* (for theatrical *ludi*, in contrast, an actual temporary wooden theater might be constructed).' Understand 'stage' for 'theater'.

⁵² Cic. *Leg.* 2.61–2 *funus ut indicatur si quid ludorum* ('that a funeral be announced if there are to be games') implies the possibility of funerals without attendant shows. Cf. Pl. *Mos.* 427–8, with its pun on *ludus* 'trick' and (the option of) *ludi funebres*. Funerals were by their very nature staged at short notice, famously short in the case of Paullus. Cic. *Phil.* 9.17 refers to the curule aediles' authority over funerals, which by the late Republic had become increasingly lavish and potentially disruptive, but there is no evidence for such oversight a century and more earlier. See Kunkel and Wittmann 1995: 486–7.

⁵³ The famous generic description of the funeral is at Polyb. 6.53–4, where ποιήσαντες τὰ νομιζόμενα might by a stretch be taken as a reference to additional entertainments on the occasion but more likely refers to the actual burial rites at the tomb. The description, offered to support the observation that Roman institutions develop civic virtues in the young, may well be truncated, though a mention of gladiators might also have served his purpose. (Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.41 on the gladiator as moral exemplum.) Fabius is described at 31.28.5 as βουλόμενος μονομαχίας ἐπὶ τῷ πατρὶ ποιεῖν, where the point is not the gladiators but Scipio's willingness to pay for them on his brother's behalf.

⁵⁴ Welch 2007: 18–22 rightly notes how incomplete the record probably is. Taylor 1937: 299 finds only five citations in extant Livy, who records gladiators precisely because they

of Paullus might be excited by the prospect of a gladiatorial show in preparation even while a play was being performed is therefore hardly a conceptual impossibility. Even if the rumour seemed unlikely, people might well show up just in case it were true, and that new crowd could quite easily have become disruptive.

One additional fact requires acknowledgement. Paullus' funeral was very like a state occasion. Later authors noted not just the lavish gladiatorial show that Polybius mentions, but the bier decorated with Macedonian trophies and the fact that Spaniards, Ligurians, and Macedonians all volunteered to carry it, giving the funeral procession the air of a triumph.⁵⁵ Nobody mentions plays: only the Terentian didascaliae tell us that *Hecyra* and *Adelphoe* were performed on this occasion. The vicissitudes of T.'s career were evidently not, in the great sweep of things, events of major significance. Whatever happened to *Hecyra* at the Megalensia of 165 was insufficient to disrupt the festival as a whole and require a restaging (*instauratio*),⁵⁶ and historians clearly found the gladiatorial display of 160 more significant than the two plays also performed on that occasion. Yet the problematic history of *Hecyra* continues to intrigue, even as the play itself continues to encourage debate.

3.2. *Hecyra*: Lines of approach

That problematic stage history is not the only source of difficulty confronting students of *Hecyra*. Literary critics of the play also face interpretive challenges, although such struggles are perhaps to be expected. An element of indeterminacy is woven into the very fabric of stage drama, since a play in performance establishes meaning not just through its scripted words, but through the actors' delivery, the actions that accompany their words, and through the audience's response to the totality of words and actions. Responses to *Hecyra* have proven especially problematic. Generations of critics, who come to the play more often as readers than as spectators, have debated whether Bacchis is generous or selfish, whether Pamphilus' moral culpability has limits, and whether Sostrata's abrupt disappearance is troubling by design, but no consensus has ever emerged. Even the most basic questions of interpretation remain contingent on too many possible stimuli and too many possible responses to establish any one set of answers as definitive. A more productive approach would be to replace the futile and

were unusual. His accounts do not clearly indicate a set schedule on these occasions, though one is often asserted (e.g. Parker 1996: 597).

⁵⁵ So Val. Max. 2.10.3: *quod spectaculum funeri speciem alterius triumphi adiecit*. See also Plut. *Aem.* 39.7–8. Paullus had previously held commands in Spain and Liguria. For the funeral as a reflection of his career, see Leigh 2004: 178–89.

⁵⁶ Stage events could do so according to Cic. *Har. resp.* 23: *si ludius constitit aut tibicen repente conticuit . . . mentes deorum immortalium ludorum instaurazione placantur*. For the practice, see Taylor 1937: 291–8. The only *instauratio* of *ludi scaenici* mentioned in extant Livy is for the *ludi Romani* of 201 (Liv. 31.4.5). The crowded liturgical calendar in April may have discouraged significant extension of the Megalensia.

reductive quest for a single meaning with the articulation of questions that open for exploration a full range of possible readings. A list of such questions for *Hecyra* could include the following:

3.2.1. *How does the play's structure shape the audience's response?*

A broadly schematic outline of the action, once Turpio has had his say in the prologue, looks like this:

- 58–197: Exposition, raising a series of expectations about Pamphilus' marriage and his relations with Bacchis
- 198–360: The dramatic problem of Philumena's withdrawal and the dilemma it poses for Sostrata and Myrrina
- 361–414: A first turning point as Pamphilus discovers the true reason for Philumena's sudden seclusion
- 415–727: Variations on the consequences of this discovery and the dilemma it poses to all concerned
- 728–872: A second turning point with the intervention of Bacchis and the subsequent discovery of the full truth
- 873–80: The solution, if not universal resolution, of Pamphilus' problem

The progress here from mounting crisis to revelation to solution is inexorably linear and thus very much in the Greek style of New Comedy. Whether as a specific legacy of Aristotelian dramatic theory or simply as a response to traditional tragic practice, Menander's plays show considerable care in constructing logical sequences of action: he was famous for having said that once he had worked out his plot, he needed only set the words to it. Apollodorus' priorities, we assume, were similar.⁵⁷ Yet T., by omitting New Comedy's characteristic expository prologue, creates a very different effect for his ostensibly Greek pattern of action. Greek audiences were normally told enough in a prologue to understand the significance, if not all the details, of the play's events before its characters do. Suspense in New Comedy is then largely a product of the spectators' anticipation, but in this play, T. keeps his Roman audience in ignorance as the action unfolds, creating an air of uncertainty, even mystery.⁵⁸ The effect is not Greek, but neither is it Roman. Traditional Roman comedy, or at least normative Plautine comedy, replaced the ironic inevitability of its Greek models with an illusion of improvisation, often teasing the audience with the wondrous capabilities of its clever slaves while distracting them from what was, notionally, the business at hand. Pl. had more dramatically interesting things to do than tell a story: many

⁵⁷ Plut. *Moralia* 347f (PCG vi Test. 70): ἔγωγε πεποίηκα τὴν κωμῳδίαν. ὥκονόμηται γὰρ ἢ ὑπόθεσις, δεῖ δ' αὐτῇ τὰ στιχίδια ἐπᾶσαι. Blanchard 1970 traces the putative Aristotelian influence behind this attitude. For plot construction in Apollodorus, see Lefèvre 1999: 148–54.

⁵⁸ Duckworth 1952: 209–35 surveys the techniques for foreshadowing and suspense in comedy. For the suspense created in *Hec.*, see Goldberg 1986: 159–62.

of his best scenes are, from the standpoint of plot, largely dispensable.⁵⁹ Since the gradual unfolding of a linear plot is far more important to the effect of a Terentian play, its mixture of story-telling, character-development, and humour will not be in the familiar Plautine proportions. In the case of *Hecyra*, reliance on suspense demands a particularly high level of emotional engagement to draw the audience into the action. How – and how well – T. generates and sustains that engagement is therefore crucial to its success.

3.2.2. *How does Terence handle his stock characters and the expectations they arouse?*

Writers of *palliatae* delighted in exploiting the genre's stock characters and situations, working hard to meet, exceed, or frustrate the expectations of audiences nearly as well versed in the conventions as they were.⁶⁰ Originality, as we have seen, was measured less by a playwright's powers of invention than by his gift for elaboration. T. is not protesting this apparent restraint on creativity but defending his right to exploit convention when he asks,

qui mage licet currentem seruom scribere,
 bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
 parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,
 puerum supponi, falli per seruom senem,
 amare odisse suspicare? denique
 nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius.

(*Eu.* 36–41)

How is it any more acceptable to pen a running slave,
 create well-meaning matrons, wicked courtesans,
 a voracious parasite, braggart soldier,
 a child switched at birth, an old man tricked by his slave,
 loves, hates, suspicions? After all,
 nothing's been said that's not been said before.

Yet this is hardly the complete picture. His own running-slave scenes are among the best in comedy. He also created two of its most sympathetic *matronae* and an especially memorable soldier and parasite.⁶¹ What distinguishes *Hecyra* is its ability to suggest such characters but then to play them against type: the *seruus* Parmeno never quite the *callidus* (879–80), Sostrata explicitly claiming to be no stereotypical *socrus* (277–8). In these cases, recognizing the conventional figures is

⁵⁹ Good examples of such 'dispensable' elements in Pl. are discussed by Zagagi 1995b. For improvisation and the illusion of improvisation in Pl., see Marshall 2006: 261–79 and further references there.

⁶⁰ Thus Wright 1974: 190–3 and Parker 1996: 608–10, with quite different opinions of T., nevertheless share this opinion of his audience.

⁶¹ Running slaves at *An.* 338–51, *Ph.* 179–99 and 841–60, *Ad.* 299–329; Sostrata and Myrrina (*Hec.*); Thraso and Gnatho (*Eu.*). For the dramatists' acknowledgements of stock types and scenes, cf. T. *Ph.* 6–8, *Hau.* 37–9, *Pl. Capt.* 57–8, *Men.* 74–6.

the first step toward appreciating T.'s unequivocal confounding of the expectations they arouse. But what of Bacchis? Her character is less clear. Don. credits T. with creating in *Hecyra* 'courtesans intent on doing the right thing beyond the common.'⁶² Parmeno nevertheless calls her *maligna et procax* (159), though the woman we eventually meet seems true to the good intentions she proclaims (835–40). *bona*, then, or still *mala*? How she treated Pamphilus immediately after his marriage might help us decide, but that is not easily determined. Four contradictory accounts of her behaviour are provided.⁶³ What seems to matter to T. is not the accuracy of the *bona* or *mala* label, but the basic psychology of the situation, which is informed by his awareness that truth under such emotionally charged conditions can be impossible to determine when different interests, emotions, and personalities collide. Nor should the characters' individual declarations about the past substitute for our own perception of how they act in the present. Whether the eventual meeting of Bacchis and Pamphilus (855–72) suggests detachment or carries an erotic charge will tell us more about their relationship than any narrative of the past, but – as is the way of drama – the effect of this climactic scene will rest as much on the actors' movement and tone as on the words of the script.

3.2.3. *Where is the play's moral centre?*

Though none of T.'s six plays is entirely conventional in action and focus, the peculiar qualities of *Hecyra* stand out even by Terentian standards. Its plot turns not on getting married but on staying married, and it ends not with revealing but with hiding the truth. Even audiences well versed in the tradition may be unsure where to invest their sympathy. The young people at the centre of the action are problematic. Philumena remains out of view, her hopes and fears left remote and unexpressed as if she were not a wife but the wronged *uirgo* of plays like *Andria* and *Adelphoe*. Her very name declares her passivity.⁶⁴ Her husband is a cipher. Don. saw the possibility of a genuinely anguished Pamphilus caught between affection for his wife and loyalty to his mother (*lenissimus in uxorem maritus et item deditus matri suae*, I Praef. 9), but his actions suggest a young man too

⁶² Don. ad 774 *meretrices honesti cupidus praeter quam peruolgatum est facit*. This is probably a generalizing plural, though Philotis in the opening scene is more pragmatic than malicious in her desires. Don. ad *Eu.* 198 makes a similar observation about the *meretrix bona*, though Thais there more clearly combines genuine self-interest with her kindness (197–203, 868–71).

⁶³ They occur at 114–70 (Parmeno), 294–8 (Pamphilus), 677–88 (Laches), and 750–60 (Bacchis), each account serving its own purpose. In arbitrarily privileging Parmeno's account, Gilula 1980: 154–61 obscures the subtlety of T.'s treatment.

⁶⁴ The Greek pass. part., i.e. 'Beloved'. (Philumene of Men. *Sic.* was at one time the property of the play's hero, Stratophanes.) The offstage birth Pamphilus describes at 373–402 recalls the situation at *An.* 459–88 and *Ad.* 478–506. Contrast Men. *Epit.* 702–877, where Pamphile not only plays a strong, central role but sets a moral example for her husband. See Appendix II.

priggish and ultimately too self-centred to win lasting sympathy. Loyalty to his mother is largely an excuse for abandoning his wife. He quite literally flees from responsibility (495, 706) and conspires at the end to avoid the more embarrassing consequences of his misdeeds.⁶⁵ His insistence on secrecy (*non . . . ut in comoediis | omnia omnes ubi resciscunt*, 866–7) may be T.'s innovation – Roman dramatists freely tinkered, sometimes significantly, with their models – and if so, he has deliberately undercut Pamphilus' moral standing.⁶⁶

Bacchis, as we have seen, is a more intriguing figure, but largely because she is ill-defined in her role as willing but unaffected agent of the play's resolution. Distinctly more engaging are the *matronae* Sostrata and Myrrina, who struggle to protect their children's interests over the remonstrance of their ignorant, often abusive husbands. Their characters are carefully delineated. Myrrina, stronger than her weak-willed husband, is capable of decisive, plot-turning action, though always taken out of sight. Her most powerful moments are reported by others (378–402, 830–5). Sostrata, the mother-in-law of the title, is more yielding to her husband but is nevertheless the more distinct stage presence. Her concerns and her responses are acted out before our eyes. Together these two women drive the plot and generate its emotional power. They are truly, perhaps uniquely sympathetic, and it is largely because of them that *Hecyra* has been called 'a woman's play'.⁶⁷ Yet they abruptly disappear before the crisis is resolved, Myrrina still worried (575–6) and Sostrata still compliant (612). Their anxiety receives no acknowledgement, their sacrifice no thanks, their suffering no recompense.⁶⁸

The fathers Laches and Phidippus are less appealing figures, Phidippus too weak and Laches too much the bully, but Laches has one quite remarkable moment that invites us to consider a generational issue. Though Laches and Sostrata live apart and are hardly themselves an example of married bliss, he is surprisingly acceptive of her decision to join him in the country (610, cf. 585–8) and dryly philosophical about the reason for doing so:

⁶⁵ So, rightly, Konstan 1983: 137, 'the entire conflict is a mock-up, pretended by Pamphilus so that he can escape a threat, not to conscience or to passion, but to ego.' Contrast the eventual confession of Menander's Moschion in a comparable scene of confrontation and embarrassment (*Sam.* 481–531) and Charisios' recognition at *Epit.* 908–30. An older line of criticism is more sympathetic to Pamphilus, e.g. Denzler 1968: 134–43, Bianco 1962: 115–16.

⁶⁶ Don. ad *Ad.* 938 makes clear that T. altered Micio's response to the marriage foisted on him. In *Cas.*, Pl. boasts of suppressing the recognition and betrothal of Diphilus' finale (64–6, 1012–18).

⁶⁷ Most eloquently by Norwood 1923: 91, 'It is a woman's play – not feminist, not expounding any special doctrine, but with women as the chief sufferers, the chief actors, the bearers here of the Terentian *humanitas*.'

⁶⁸ This too may be T.'s innovation, since Don. ad 825 (*in Graeca haec aguntur, non narrantur*) raises the possibility that Myrrina was present at the climax. Chrysis, Demeas' highly sympathetic *palanke*, receives equally abrupt treatment at the end of Men. *Sam.*, where a reconciliation is implied (730) but unrepresented. See Traill 2008: 167–9.

odiosa haec est aetas adulescentulis.
e medio aequom excedere est: postremo nos iam fabulae
sumu', Pamphile, senex atque anus.

(619–21)

Our time of life is hateful to young people.
It's best to move out of the way: in the end, Pamphilus, we are
the old man and old woman of the tale.

The *fabula* in question remains unidentified and the allusion therefore problematic, but such startling self-awareness hints at an unexpected capacity for sacrifice even in Laches and reminds us that despite his own youth, T. consistently found more interest in the anxious responses of parents than in the anxiety-producing actions of their children.

3.2.4. *What comparisons are productive?*

As we have seen, T. has, for better and worse, long been compared with his Greek models, whether in the particular or the general, by conjecture or with recourse to extant texts.⁶⁹ Comparisons with Plautus have not always worked to his advantage, though there is growing recognition that not to be Plautus is not necessarily to be an inferior dramatist.⁷⁰ Attention to other plays in the Terentian corpus has proven especially productive: *Hecyra* is in some sense a sequel to *Andria* (Penwill 2004: 131) and shares with *Eunuchus* an ostensibly indulgent and yet distinctly troubling treatment of sexual predation (James 1998). Such associations are natural, either matching two plays written in sequence or pairing T.'s greatest success with what is often taken to be his most notorious failure, but a third pairing has largely escaped notice, viz. with *Adelphoe*, which shared the programme with *Hecyra* at the funeral of Aemilius Paullus.⁷¹ The two may well have played on that occasion to the same crowd, but once beyond the prologue, each uses a somewhat different expository technique to establish its relationship with its audience.

The immediate appeal of *Adelphoe* is easy to grasp. Its opening sequence, from Micio's monologue (26–81) to the dramatization of his quarrel with Demea (81–154) to the slapstick besting of the pimp Sannio (155–287) is brisk and varied, but even more striking is how T. pitches the play's essential conflict to the audience.

⁶⁹ So for *Hec.*, with varying degrees of probability, Kuiper 1938, Sewart 1974, Lowe 1983, Lefèvre 1999. Though no Greek model of a Terentian play survives, much can be learned from comparison with Greek analogues. See Introduction 1.3 and Appendix II.

⁷⁰ T.'s reputation is defended with great energy by Parker 1996. Wright 1974: 127–51 stresses his stylistic distinction. Reintegration of T. into the *palliata* tradition is a major objective of Sharrock 2009.

⁷¹ So, e.g., Parker 1996: 592–601 treats *Hec.* without *Ad.* and Leigh 2004: 158–91, *Ad.* without *Hec.*, noting that 'the funeral games witnessed the second performance of the *Hecyra* or *Mother-in-Law* and, most importantly, the première for the poet's last work: the *Adelphoe* or *Brothers*' (158). Why 'most importantly'?

Micio's defence of indulgent parenting persistently associates his personal view with universal truth. So, for example, in speaking of his brother:

nimum ipse durust praeter aequomque et bonum,
et errat longe mea quidem sententia
qui imperium credat grauius esse aut stabilius
ui quod fit quam illud quod amicitia adiungitur.

(64–7)

He is himself far too strict, beyond what's reasonable or right.
Anyone, at least in my view, strays far from the truth
who thinks that power is firmer or better grounded
when based on force than that which partners with friendship.

The general and the specific are inextricably linked in his mind, and since nearly everyone has an opinion about parenting, spectators soon find themselves aroused by their own experience before being drawn into the specifics of this particular dramatic problem.⁷²

Hecyra has a quite different expository dynamic, and not simply because its start is quiet and rather talky.⁷³ Like *Adelphoe*, it begins with a generality (58–9), but this play shifts immediately to the specific (at line 60) and keeps its focus on the business at hand. *Hecyra's* evocation of stereotypes is always followed by a fuller, more emphatic denial of their relevance (277–8, 776, 879–80). Struggles against generalization and cliché are what create the play's inner tension, but to feel that tension, spectators must be engrossed in its characters' world. Where the audience of *Adelphoe* is drawn at once to the larger educational principle and only then to its instantiation in Micio and Demea (and their sons, Aeschinus and Ctesipho), the audience for *Hecyra* must care from the outset about the specific question of why Philumena fled from her mother-in-law's house. Only then is it possible to appreciate the larger moral crisis created when the two fathers blame their wives for her flight and Pamphilus entangles himself in an expanding web of conflicting obligations.

Terence does not leave creation of the requisite sympathy to chance: he maximizes every opportunity for his characters to win the audience to their point of view. In the initial scene between Laches and Sostrata, for example,

⁷² Twenty-nine of Micio's fifty-two lines are general principles, distributed throughout the speech: 28–34, 38–9, 52–3, 55–8, 64–77. His moralizing tendency has long been noted, e.g. Johnson 1968, but not his ability to polarize audiences by arousing their own passions. Those insufficiently aroused soon have the slapstick humiliation of Sannio to amuse them, another way to be drawn into the dramatic situation. That scene, imported from Diphilus, reflects Terence's care in calculating the pace and style of his extended *captatio*.

⁷³ The question here is not the familiar one of what is explained when (and how the Greek original may have done it differently), but what kind of relationship the scenes T. wrote establish between characters and audience. For the former, more traditional expository concern, see most recently Lefèvre 1999: 35–41.

Sostrata follows her husband from their house and undercuts his opening rant against women with an aside to the audience that not only declares the untruth of his suspicions (205n.), but establishes a link with the audience that culminates with her monologue at 274. Asides also figure prominently in the conventional scene of delayed approach that at last brings Laches and Bacchis face to face (727–32). There each figure assumes a posture for the audience's benefit before turning to the other.⁷⁴ The play is also extremely rich in monologues, each one in effect a bid for the audience's sympathy and some, most notably the parallel monologues of Pamphilus (361–414) and Bacchis (816–40) that introduce and then resolve the play's central dilemma, enhanced by vividly reported dialogue that encourages the audience to see the situation through the speaker's eyes.⁷⁵ The result is a more intimate play. It is no less 'theatrical' than *Adelphoe* in its use of stage conventions, but it uses the capabilities of the stage in a different way to create a different effect. It is not for that reason a better or worse play than its cousin, but it does make different demands on its audience.

If *Hecyra* really did run into trouble on its first two presentations and that trouble was not caused entirely by boxers and gladiators, its dramatic technique may have been a factor. Brilliant writing of this kind would work best before an audience open to its subtleties, an audience perhaps difficult to find at a funeral. There were probably different crowds on different occasions, and a funeral very likely attracted the most difficult crowd of all, fluid and unpredictable, a little long on those disposed toward armed combat and perhaps a little short on those attuned to psychological niceties. Occasion and setting – and how a play is tailored to its occasion and setting – are as crucial to success as the artistry of the text. Even as we focus, as we inevitably do, on text, we need to remain alert to the conditions of performance and work those variables into our calculations to understand why, as Terence himself reminds us, *dubiam fortunam esse scaenicam* (16).

4. LANGUAGE AND STYLE

Change came with increasing rapidity to Latin over the last two centuries of the Republic as ever more people found ever more reasons to speak the Romans' language. Though the Senate never established any official language policy or attempted to impose linguistic hegemony on subject peoples, competence in Latin proved to be so economically or politically advantageous by the second century BCE that non-natives throughout the Mediterranean basin began acquiring it. In the Aegean, for example, the international trading community on Delos had long found bilingualism expedient, while in 180 BCE, the people of Cumae

⁷⁴ In each case, the aside is emphasized by a metrical shift: senarii at 205–6, a single dimeter at 731 to set off the preceding, metrically equivalent asides of Bacchis and Laches.

⁷⁵ The particular importance of monologue in the play may be Terence's innovation (cf. Don. ad *Hec.* 825, Denzler 1968: 13–18), but the vivid style of these speeches is characteristic of Menander. See Nünlist 2002.

on the Bay of Naples, proud native speakers of Greek or Oscan, nevertheless petitioned the Senate for permission to conduct their public business in Latin.⁷⁶ And in the capital city, of course, the language was inevitably tugged in various directions as the population grew larger and more ethnically, socially, and economically diverse. These developments had significant aesthetic, as well as technical, consequences for both how T.'s characters speak and how their speech sounded to subsequent generations.

4.1. Orthography

Though T., pursuing his career in the 160s BCE, wrote in a genre that had by then developed a characteristic style of its own, he was hardly immune to the forces of linguistic change around him. For that reason, he sometimes sounds more 'modern' to us than Pl. a generation earlier, but he still falls on the far side of what we perceive as a linguistic watershed. His language looked and sounded somewhat different from the 'standard' Latin familiar to us from Cicero and Virgil two hundred and more years later, and it is customary to preserve the most significant of those differences in our printed text of the plays.⁷⁷ Not all the old spellings are reproduced, though consistency might encourage it. Editors are unmoved by the fact that even Cicero and Virgil wrote *caussae* and *casus* for *causae* and *casus*, but the accusative plural of *i*-stems was regularly *-īs* until the Augustan age, and so we consistently print *omnīs* and *fidelīs*.⁷⁸ The genitive singular of the second declension is regularly *-ī*: thus *Terentī*, not *Terentii*.⁷⁹ Other spellings felt to be old-fashioned or deliberately archaic when encountered in a late Republican author like Sallust probably represent the language as spoken by T.'s contemporaries and have a legitimate claim to attention. The most common such spellings that are reproduced in modern dramatic texts are these:

-*u*- instead of -*i*- before labial consonants, e.g. *maxume*, *lacrumae*, *lubenter*

-*u*- instead of -*e*- in gerunds and gerundives of the third and fourth conjugations, e.g. *experiundo*, *faciundum*

uor- instead of *uer*-, e.g. *uortam*, *advorsum*

-*uom* instead of -*uum* and -*uos* instead of -*uus*, e.g. *aequom*, *iniquom*, *seruom*, *tuom*, *seruos*, *cervuos*. So too *relinquont* (461).

⁷⁶ Liv. 40.43.1. The request was clearly an exercise in political ingratiation, not legal necessity since the Cumaeans had enjoyed the *ciuitas sine suffragio* since 338 BCE. See Adams 2003: 113–15, and for the situation on Delos, 642–9.

⁷⁷ For the salient characteristics of mid-Republican Latin, see Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 90–111, Palmer 1961: 74–94.

⁷⁸ Var. *L.* 8.67 notes the lack of standardization in his day between *-ī/-ē* and *-ēs/īs* in the abl. sing. and acc. pl. respectively. (So too Gell. 10.24.8, Macr. 1.4.20.) The grammarian Probus (ap. Gell. 13.21) reported similar inconsistency in what he took to be an autograph MS of Virgil. For *-ss-* see Quint. 1.7.20 and Allen 1978: 36. The MSS of Pl. and T. are not consistent in their preservation of original spelling, nor are modern editors. See, e.g., Redard 1956, Questa 2001: 68–73.

⁷⁹ An *-ū* genitive is not attested until the late Republic. See Weiss 2009: 223.

In addition, dramatic texts of this period preserve a few distinctions later obscured by some of the phonological changes already under way in T.'s time. Most notable of these are forms in *quo-* that were later spelled (and pronounced) *cu-*. T.'s text thus distinguishes the conjunction *quom* from the preposition *cum* and offers *quor* where authors of Cicero's generation were beginning to write *cur*. The fact that T. more often uses *cui* and *cuius* than *quoi* and *quouis* is a further indication of the language in flux.⁸⁰ Other clearly old-fashioned forms probably survived in comic usage because they were metrically convenient: thus we find *ipsus* as well as *ipse*, both *potis est* and *potest*, the subjunctive singulars *siem*, *sies*, *siet* and plural *sient*, and the present passive infinitive ending in *-ier* (e.g. *percontarier*, *uiderier*), which is especially common at line end.⁸¹ Some genuinely obsolete forms, like the sigmatic subjunctive *faxo*, survived in formulaic expressions like *ita di deaeque faxint* (102).

4.2. Diction

T.'s diction is restrained by the traditional standards of Roman comedy. Where Pl. deliberately exaggerates features of colloquial speech, T. tends to understate them: terms of abuse, diminutives and frequentatives, extravagant catalogues and extended metaphors are all rare. Puns and neologisms are also uncommon by Plautine standards. Linguistic twists like Phidippus' casual juxtaposition of *aderit* and *oderit* (543) are hardly played for laughs, and Terentian characters rarely have outlandish or significant names.⁸² Nor do they seem to relish the very sound of Latin words as thoroughly as Pl.'s characters do.⁸³ Their

⁸⁰ So too the old nom. pron. *hisce* (= *hi*) found in Pl. appears a generation later in T. only once (*Eu.* 269). For the difference between Latin [k^w] and [k] see Allen 1978: 14–20. Change was naturally slow and erratic. At Cic. *Mur.* 41 *dicundi* coexists beside *decernendi* and *audiendi*. The famous papyrus of Cornelius Gallus (P. Qasr Ibrim inv. 78–3–11), probably written between 50 and 25 BCE, has *quom* but *maxima*. Quint. found the change to *maximus* first in an inscription of Caesar, while Scipio Africanus popularized the spelling *uer-* over *uor-*. Quint.'s own teachers, i.e. early in the first century CE, still preferred to write nom. *cervos* and *servos* (1.7.21–26). For the complex forces behind the standardization of language, see Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 77–89.

⁸¹ Use of such metrically convenient variants continued, though with changing nuance, beyond comedy. Catullus experimented with *potis est* (65.3, 72.7, 76.24, *potis sit* at 115.3) as well as the usual *potest*; the *-ier* infinitive appears in poem 61 (*citarier* 42, *compararier* 65, 70, 75, *nitier* 68) and poem 68 (*componier*, 141). Virgil's readers would more surely have heard *potis est* (*Aen.* 3.671, 9.796, 11.148) as an archaism.

⁸² Gnatho 'Jaw', the parasite of *Eunuchus*, is the sort of exception that proves the rule. Whether the name Micio, the lenient brother of *Adelphoe*, conceals a bilingual pun on μικρός 'small' and *paullus*, is debated. See Leigh 2004:162, 189. Fontaine 2010: 61–8 finds analogous bilingual play in the name of Pl.'s parasite Curculio, recalling both *curculio* 'weevil' and γοργός 'vigorous'.

⁸³ Barsby 1999: 19–27 offers a useful comparison. See also Dutch 2008: 18–30, Fantham 1972: 3–6. When Wright 1974: 151 concludes that T. 'writes, by and large, as if the comic tradition at Rome never existed,' these stylistic differences are what lie behind his broader aesthetic judgment.

speech is nevertheless peppered with a variety of conversational mannerisms not commonly found in more formal Latin, e.g. emphatic particles like *pol* and *hercle* (in origin oaths by Pollux and Hercules), emotive sounds like *hem*, *ehem*, and *heus*, where the exact meaning depends on the context, and the emphatic *em* meaning ‘There you are!’ or when signalling a blow, ‘Take that!’ There are also contractions. Syncopated perfects (e.g. *amisti* = *amisisti*, *audisti* = *audiuisti*) are common, as are some specifically conversational forms like *sodes* (*si audes* ‘please’) and the compression of demonstrative *-ce* and interrogative *-ne* (e.g. *sensistin* = *sensisti* + *-ne*, *hiscin* = *his* + *-ce* + *-ne*). There is also an exclamatory *ne*, which looks like a conjunction or adverb but is in fact the Greek asseverating particle νή (274, 799). Special care must be taken over the imperative *cēdo* (pl. *cette*), not from *cēdo*, *cēdere* but from the deictic particle *ce* + *do*, *dare* ‘Tell me!’ (458, 698) or ‘Hand it over!’ (708),⁸⁴ and *sine*, the imperative of *sino*, which has a range of colloquial meanings from ‘Put up with it!’ (600) to ‘Never mind!’ (707). The connotations of all such expressions, especially the emotional charge they carry and their register (and thus the English equivalents we choose for them), must be deduced from the specific requirements of the situations in which they appear.⁸⁵

A characteristic assortment of such colloquial features appears at 753–5 as old Laches asks a favour of the *meretrix* Bacchis.

LA. *lepida es. sed scin quid uolo potius sodes facias?* BA. *quid uis? cedo.*

LA. *eas ad mulieres huc intro atque istuc iusiurandum idem polliceare illis.*

LA. You’re very obliging. But do you know what I’d most like you to do? BA. What? Tell me.

LA. That you go to the women inside here and make this same promise to them.

The contractions *scin* and *sodes*, the latter simply softening the imperative, *cedo* meaning ‘tell me’, the demonstrative *istuc*, and the subjunctives *facias*, *eas*, and *polliceare* hanging in tandem on Laches’ *uolo* without a subordinating *ut* all suggest the casual speech of daily life.⁸⁶

4.3. Arrangement

Other manifestations of colloquial style can be more challenging for modern readers to master. A word or phrase readily inferred from the context may

⁸⁴ For the form, probably based on an old aor. imper., see Weiss 2009: 434. The colloquialism endured: so in the fifth cent. CE, Macr. 5.3.17 *cedo igitur Vergilianum uolumen* ‘Let me have a text of Virgil.’

⁸⁵ No generalization about meaning is thus any better than the specific interpretations on which it rests. Pioneering work in this area was done by Hofmann 1951 and Luck 1964. Müller 1997 is especially reliable. Bagordo 2001 and Karakasis 2005 can be useful.

⁸⁶ The indicative verb in an ind. quest. is also characteristic of early Latin, especially when introduced by a form of *quis*. Examples in *SEL* 1.120–2, and see the note ad *Hec.* 273.

be left unexpressed (**ellipsis**). Typical examples: *ille primo se negare* (120), where the subject of the dialogue, Pamphilus' refusal to marry, supplies the missing predicate for *se* (viz. *uxorem ducturum*) and *nescire arbitramini* (215), where the missing first person subject of *nescire* is easily inferred from the preceding *soleo*. At 748, indignation and annoyance produce a terse exchange,⁸⁷

quis id ait? :: socrus. :: men? :: te ipsam.

Who says that? :: His mother-in-law. :: That *I* did? :: Yes, you.

As at 753–5, *ut* may be omitted before commands, though it can then be difficult, at least for modern grammarians, to distinguish between an indirect command with the subordinating conjunction suppressed, i.e. *et te oro porro [ut] in hac re auditor sis mihi*, and a hortatory subjunctive in parataxis, i.e. *et te oro porro: in hac re auditor sis mihi* (721).⁸⁸

T. may also employ a flexible word order designed to recall the loose, sometimes emotional jumble of words in conversation. Several ways to create a sense of ease are apparent on inspection, though their specific effect on listeners can be more difficult to judge. Some possibilities: The key word or phrase in a sentence may simply be thrust ahead of its natural syntactic position, e.g. *nam audiuisse uocem pueri uisust uagientis* (517), which emphasizes the fact that Phidippus heard something (*audiuisse*) over what he heard (*uocem pueri uagientis*) and consigns the main, but semantically unimportant verb (*uisust*) to the position of least emphasis. Sometimes an interlocking word order works in conjunction with the metre to create its effect, e.g. *ego dum illo licitumst usa sum benigno et lepido et comi* (837), where *illo*, the object of *usa sum*, is brought ahead of its clause for emphasis and creates a second emphasis for the phrase modifying it, *benigno et lepido et comi*, by setting that phrase after the characteristic diaeresis of the iambic septenarius. A common variant on this pattern is to add a syntactic shift, moving a word not just physically out of its expected position but also grammatically out of its logical clause, a figure called **prolepsis**, e.g. *filium multimodis iam exspecto ut redeat domum* (280), where *filius* is logically the subject of *redeat* but is instead made the object of *exspecto*. Prolepsis may even be used to exploit a momentary ambiguity, as at 774–5, *Pamphilo me facere ut redeat uxor | oportet*, where syntax clearly shows *Pamphilo* to be the dat. object of *redeat*, but the ethical idea of working in Pamphilus' interest is latent. And, of course, these stylistic devices can combine, e.g. *o mi Pamphile, abs te quam ob rem haec abierit causam uides* (382), where a more linear order would be, *o mi Pamphile, uides causam quam ob rem haec abs te abierit*.

⁸⁷ For full discussion of ellipsis in T. see Müller 1997: 187–214 and for *Hec.* the notes ad loc.

⁸⁸ Further examples in *SEL* 1.217–18, and for the distinction between **parataxis** (co-ordination) and **hypotaxis** (subordination), *NLS* §§98–9. See also *Hec.* 744n.

4.4. *Aesthetic effects*

Such stylistic choices, each seemingly minor in isolation, have a significant effect in aggregate. Though the plays' characters represent the same social classes and occupations we find in Pl., what passes for Terentian 'street talk' sounds like the talk of a far more genteel street. That represents an important shift. Other writers of *palliata* comedy, from Andronicus at the beginning to Turpilius 150 years later, universally cultivated the extravagant linguistic effects so apparent in Pl. Even T.'s esteemed predecessor Caecilius Statius, whom scholarship once cast as a kind of transitional figure between Pl. and T., actually took care to preserve the traditional style.⁸⁹ Lovers of that more robust comic diction may well have found T.'s new effects effete and bloodless, or so T. himself seems to acknowledge in the prologue to *Phormio*, when speaking of the jealous rival posterity knows as Luscius of Lanuvium.⁹⁰

Postquam poeta uetus poetam non potest
retrahere a studio et transdere hominem in otium,
maledictis detertere ne scribat parat:
qui ita dictitat, quas ante hic fecit fabulas
tenui esse oratione et scriptura leui . . .

(*Ph.* 1–5)

Since the old poet cannot drive our poet
from his work and force our man into retirement,
he is using slanders to keep him from writing:
He keeps saying our playwright's previous plays
are meagre in style and light in substance . . .

Under the later influence of Callimachus, *tenuis* and *levis* would become positive terms in the Roman aesthetic vocabulary, but here they are clearly pejorative.⁹¹ The plays criticized would have been *Andria* and *Hecyra*, both of them notably short on traditional stylistic effects, though T.'s very statement of the accusation

⁸⁹ T. aligns himself with Caecilius at *Hec.* 14–23, the passage that probably lies behind the later story that Caecilius was the first to recognize his talent. For the fundamental traditionality of Caecilius, see Wright 1974: 105–26, and for T.'s stylistic innovations, Haffter 1953: 80–93, Goldberg 1986: 170–202.

⁹⁰ The *uetus poeta* identified as Luscius by Don. ad *An.* 1 is T.'s straw man throughout the prologues, e.g. *An.* 5–7, *Hau.* 22–6, *Ad.* 15–17. See Duckworth 1952: 62–5, Garton 1972: 41–51, Manuwal 2011: 242–4. There is no evidence that Luscius was in any official sense a spokesman for the *Collegium poetarum*, as suggested by Wright 1974: 183–6 and now Umbrico 2010: 85–90.

⁹¹ 'Small' and 'insignificant' are the values commonly associated with the words throughout their history. So Cic., ironically, of Fannius' accounts: *leue et tenue hoc nomen est?* *HS* $\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa$ *sunt* (*Q. Rosc.* 4) and two centuries later, Gell. 2.6.2 *uerbum esse leue* (of a problematic word choice). The mode and timing of their aesthetic revaluation (and T.'s role in it, if any) are problematic. See Sharrock 2009: 80–3, and for doubts about Callimachean influence as early as Pl., Hunter 2006: 81–4.

here suggests its own refutation by slyly aping the old style it replaces through the juxtaposition of *poeta uetus poetam* in a line full of *p*'s (cf. Pl. *Truc.* 1 *perparuam partem postulat Plautus loci*), the teasing near-jingles of *hominem in otium* and *scribat parat*, the frequentative *dictitat*, and the line-ending alliteration of *fecit fabulas*. T.'s repudiation of Luscius – a parody of his dramaturgy follows immediately (6–8) – is thus cast in the elder poet's own terms.

Luscius' criticism did not prevail. What T. elsewhere proudly calls 'good writing' (*pura oratio*, *Hau.* 46) led Romans in succeeding generations to value the plays as stylistic models: T. was praised for his *lectus sermo* (Cicero) and as *puri sermonis amator* (Caesar), and long after the plays ceased to be mainstays of the commercial stage, they endured as mainstays of the school curriculum.⁹² Their virtue in that role was *elegantia* (Cic. *Att.* 7.3.10, Quint. 10.1.99), the very term Quintilian famously applied to Tibullus (*tersus atque elegans*, 10.1.93), and that proved to be a quality with staying power. In tenth-century Saxony, the pious Hrotsvit of Gandersheim still found inspiration in T.'s 'sweetness of style' (*dulcedine sermonis*), the very trait Cicero had praised a millennium earlier (*omnia dulcia dicens*). That stylistic achievement, however, had two unexpected consequences. First, T.'s growing prestige in antiquity soon motivated some readers to question not the quality of the plays but their authorship. T. had himself acknowledged the support of certain anonymous *homines nobiles* (*Ad.* 15–21), and it was a matter of record that *Hecyra* and *Adelphoe* were performed at the funeral of Aemilius Paullus, father of the younger Scipio. By the later second century, that hint of association took a sinister turn when it was swept up in a rising tide of anti-Scipionic propaganda, and by the first century it led to explicit accusations of ghost-writing by Laelius or Scipio or some other suitably aristocratic Roman.⁹³ Those reluctant to praise an ex-slave from North Africa as a stylistic model could instead look to a more worthy figure, much as some modern readers periodically convince themselves that only a more august personage could possibly have written the plays attributed to that glover's son from Stratford.⁹⁴

Not even the most scurrilous of rumours, however, did any lasting harm to T.'s reputation. Cicero and Quintilian made a point of brushing them aside, and

⁹² The epigrams of Cicero and Caesar are preserved in Suet. *Vita* 7. From the famous lightness of T.'s style may derive the eventual statement that he was himself *mediocri statura, gracili corpore* (*Vita* 6). So, we are told, the Hellenistic poet Philotas of Cos was so thin (λεπτός) he weighted his shoes with lead to keep from blowing away (Ath. 12.552b, Ael. *VH* 9.14).

⁹³ Suet. *Vita* 2 traces allegations of sexual attraction between T. and Scipio (at best a chronological improbability) to Porcius Licinus late in the second century. Umbrico 2010: 14–39, though too willing to believe the claims, recognizes their role in the later propaganda campaign. Accusations of ghost-writing seem to begin with an anti-Scipionic speech by C. Memmius in the mid-second century and resurface in an anecdote Suet. attributes to Cornelius Nepos (*Vita* 4). This type of charge is a well-established tool of literary invective (Fairweather 1983: 328–9).

⁹⁴ Candidates in the modern debate over 'Shakespeare' come and go, with the Earl of Oxford currently in favour. Shapiro 2010: 17–69 shows how eighteenth-century 'bardolatry' precipitated and fuelled the resulting controversy. As with T., class-consciousness plays a significant role in resisting the historical reality.

the authorship question lost its urgency. Modern critics, however, found a new way to turn a virtue into a defect. The very elegance of T.'s understated Latinity came to be so closely identified with the 'Attic' style of his models that critics more sympathetic to Greek aesthetic achievements than to Roman ones began regarding him not as an innovator in a Roman context but as faithful copyist of a Greek one. His art was then often mistaken for the translator's art.⁹⁵ There are in fact times when T. can be observed following his Greek original fairly closely – Don. preserves a clear example at *Hec.* 58 – but the apparent Atticism of his style rests on thoroughly Latin foundations, as close inspection shows.⁹⁶ His writing is many things, but it is not Greek verse in translation.

5. METRE

Roman drama was verse drama. Traditional metrics, which seeks to describe its rhythmic phenomena as fully and precisely as possible, developed a rich, complex, and sometimes daunting set of technical terms, categories and 'laws' for doing so. The fullest such description of T.'s metrical practice is Laidlaw 1938. More recent approaches to metrics strive for greater explanatory power by identifying the organizing principles behind the poets' metrical practice, a mode of analysis that emphasizes the structures that ostensibly distinct metrical patterns share rather than the differences observed between and among them. This new metrical sensibility is applied especially well to T. by Barsby 1999: 290–304, building on Gratwick 1993: 40–63, 248–60. Another contemporary approach treats metre more explicitly as a function of language, recognizing that metrical practice is rooted in linguistic practice and, as is especially clear in the case of drama, represents both evidence for and a response to the rhythms of natural speech. Allen 1973 provides an essential introduction to this approach. See now Fortson 2008. A basic sketch of the principles at work in Terentian metrics is provided here.

5.1. Syllables

Spoken Latin employed a stress accent, giving acoustic prominence to one syllable of a word by delivering it with greater force. Words of two syllables regularly received this stress on the first syllable, e.g. *ámor, cánō*.⁹⁷ In polysyllabic words, the

⁹⁵ So, with a hint of condescension, Jachman 1934: 625, 'Auch Übersetzen ist eine Kunstleistung' For Ludwig 1968: 182, 'The fundamental difference between Terence's achievement and that of a creative poet . . . should not be obscured.' That line was easier to pursue when less original Attic drama was known.

⁹⁶ Jachmann 1934: 613–18 provides a useful compilation of the surviving evidence for T.'s 'translation'. See also Traina 1968, and for the superficiality of his Atticism, Goldberg 1986: 187–92.

⁹⁷ Apparent exceptions like *ēdūc* and *illūc* have actually lost a final syllable, viz. *ēdūce*, *illūce*. Latin avoided pairs like Eng. *cóntent* (n.) and *contént* (adj.), *présent* (n.) and *présént*

stress depended on whether the next-to-last ('penultimate') syllable was heavy or light. If it was heavy, i.e. contained a long vowel or diphthong or was 'closed' by a consonant, it received the stress, e.g. *amōris*, *canāmus* and also *habētur*, *patēnus*. Otherwise the syllable was light and the stress moved back to the preceding syllable, e.g. *habeō*, *cēcinī*. Any Latin utterance, whether prose or verse, thus presents a sequence of stressed and unstressed syllables: *senātus haec intēlegit, cōsul uidet*. Since heavy syllables were felt to take twice as long to pronounce as light ones, an utterance also has a characteristic rhythm, a function of time as well as stress.

When poets began writing in Latin for the Roman stage, they exploited the phonological properties of the spoken language to create sequences of light and heavy syllables that recalled the quantitative patterns found in their Greek models.⁹⁸ So, for example, the string of syllables that constitutes *Hecyra* 58 forms the following pattern:

per-pol-quam-pau-cōs-re-pe-ri-ās-me-re-trī-ci-bus

— — — — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ —

All the rhythmic sequences of *Hecyra* are produced by similar strings. In this play, all these strings are notionally either light-heavy (i.e. iambic, ∪ —) or heavy-light (i.e. trochaic, — ∪), but because actual speech is rarely so regular, these strings are not normally composed exclusively of iambs or trochees. The iambic or trochaic character of a line will almost always reveal itself at the end, but dramatists allowed themselves considerable flexibility in allocating heavy and light syllables at most other positions. Syllables that a rigid metrical scheme would require to be light might in practice be either light or heavy (*anceps* 'two-headed' (= × in metrical notation)), and two light syllables could often be substituted for a single heavy one ('resolution') even where an *anceps* syllable was being treated as heavy. This system of substitution meant that a notional iamb (∪ —) could in practice be not only a spondee (— —), but a dactyl (— ∪ ∪), an anapaest (∪ ∪ —), a tribrach (∪ ∪ ∪), or a proceleusmatic (∪ ∪ ∪ ∪).⁹⁹ Such flexibility enables the sequence of

(v). For fuller discussion of Latin accentuation, see Allen 1978: 83–8, Weiss 2009: 110–12. For purposes of syllabification, a single consonant between vowels begins the following syllable (e.g. *pau-cōs*). Two or more consonants in succession will end one syllable and begin the next, except where a consonant cluster can itself begin a word (e.g. *nūl-la* but *me-re-trīx*). See Weiss 2009: 67–71.

⁹⁸ Since there are significant phonological differences between Greek and Latin, doing so required considerable ingenuity. See West 1982: 186–8. To avoid confusion in what follows, vowel quantities are marked *above* the vowel and syllable weight is indicated by marks *below* the syllable.

⁹⁹ The rules of Latin phonology, however, did normally restrict resolution in two ways. First, the two light syllables are generally found either in the same word (e.g. *rē-pē-rī-ās*) or in two closely connected words (e.g. *inter eas*, i.e. *in-tē-rē-ās*). Second, the two light syllables will not be the final two syllables of a polysyllabic word. The first of these restrictions, 'Ritschl's law', avoids splitting a resolution between words (i.e. ∪ | ∪). The second, 'Hermann's law',

syllables at *Hecyra* 58 to be perceived, despite its rhythmic variations, as a six-foot iambic line:

— — | — — | — ∪ ∪ | ∪ — | ∪ ∪ — | ∪ —

5.2. Prosody

No Roman ever carried on a conversation in the cadences of Virgil or Horace or Ovid, but poetry written for the comic stage clearly sought to capture the rhythms of ordinary speech.¹⁰⁰ This tendency of dramatic verse to recall, if not always to duplicate, the phonology of the spoken language distinguishes its prosody from the more formal Latin verse of later times. Beside a more liberal use of anacpe and resolution to vary the arrangement of light and heavy syllables within the line, certain habits of pronunciation could alter the very recognition of syllables or perception of their weight. A few of these habits, like elision, manifest themselves in Latin verse of all periods, but others are much more frequent in drama. The most noteworthy practices affecting the scansion of Terentian verse are these:

Apocope, ‘cutting off’ a final *-e* or an *-s* that would otherwise close a light syllable. This often happens to the suffix *ne*, e.g. *egon* (*ego* + *ne*), *tun* (*tu* + *ne*), and less commonly to *ille*, e.g. *ill’ primo se negare* (120). Loss of a final *s* is indicated in the text by an apostrophe, e.g. *Philoti’*, *te oblectasti tam diu?* (84). Apocope also produces colloquialisms like *satin* (*satis* + *ne*) and *uiden* (*uides* + *ne*) and may otherwise suggest a conversational tone.

Elision and **prodelision**. When a word ends with a vowel or a vowel + *m* (indicating nasalization) and the following word begins with a vowel or an *h* (indicating aspiration), the first vowel in that sequence normally has no metrical value. Elision is common and may occur even across changes of speaker, where it can have dramatic value, e.g. *Hec.* 100:

uxorem habere. :: habere autem? :: eho tu, an non habet?

How elision was actually treated in delivery remains problematic. In this instance, we might expect a pause for emphasis after *eho tu*, even though scansion demands elision, not hiatus. Possible strategies for treating elision are reviewed by Gratwick 1993: 251–3.

A subtype of elision, common even in later, more formal types of verse, involves *es* and *est*. These regularly lose their opening vowel (aphaeresis) and elide with what precedes, producing what our text prints as a single word, e.g.

avoids creating an anapaestic rhythm split between two words (i.e. ∪ ∪ | —). See Fortson 2008: 7–8. Bibliography and discussion in Ceccarelli 1991: 350–3.

¹⁰⁰ So for Fortson 2008, ‘Plautus’s poetry therefore is invaluable for the light it can shed on the phonology-syntax interface of the spoken Latin of his time’ (10). Though T.’s musical effects often differ from those of his predecessors (Braun 1970, Moore 2007), the basic rules for creating the desired rhythms remain constant among authors of the *palliata* tradition.

commeritast, aequomst. This is called **prodelision**. When prodelision combines with **apocope** to generate a potentially ambiguous form, an apostrophe is used, e.g. *quid exanimatu's obsecro?*

Hiatus. Lack of an expected elision is fairly common in Pl. but used sparingly by T., usually for special emphasis. It is indicated in the text by a long mark over the non-elided vowel or diphthong, e.g. *Hec. 1:*

Hecyra est huic nomen fabulaē. haec quom datast . . .

Elision may also be avoided by a related phenomenon called **Prosodic hiatus**, where a syllable is lightened instead of elided, as in the common expression *ita me dī amabunt* (106, 642). Emphatic monosyllables, which might otherwise disappear in pronunciation, can also be treated this way, e.g. *Hec. 379:*

nunc ad eam uisam. :: heus Sostrata. :: hēm? :: iterum istinc excludere.

Prosodic hiatus is noted in the text by a short mark over the vowel that is not elided.

Iambic shortening, sometimes called 'breuis breuians'. A word of iambic shape (e.g. *āmō, bōnīs*) may have its second vowel shortened, so that \sim — becomes $\sim\sim$ (technically, a 'pyrrhic'). Thus *āmō* becomes *āmō* and *bōnīs* becomes *bōnīs*. A polysyllabic word may also undergo the process, e.g. *nēmīnī*. This shortening is primarily a result of word accent since the second, unaccented syllable of an iambic word naturally lightens. In phrases of the shape \sim — \times , an accent on the third syllable lightens the middle one, e.g. *uel hīc Pāmphilus* and *ut ād paūca*. Iambic shortening is indicated in the text by a short mark over the affected vowel.

Synizesis. Two vowels in succession may blend to form a single heavy syllable, an especially common occurrence with oblique forms of the pronoun *is*, e.g. *ēās, ēūm*, genitive singular of the demonstrative pronoun, e.g. *illīūs, huīūs*, possessive adjectives, e.g. *suām*, but also occasionally with other words, e.g. *fūisse, diē, spēi*. Words of iambic shape like *ēās* could instead be scanned as two lights by iambic shortening, but synizesis is generally preferred by editors. See Soubiran 1988: 179–84. Instances of synizesis are marked, as here, by a ligature in the text.

5.3. Verse patterns

Iambo-trochaic verse is traditionally said to be structured in 'feet', i.e. iambs or trochees, and described by the number of feet in the line. A verse composed of six iambic feet is thus called an iambic senarius.¹⁰¹

Verses are commonly divided into two (rarely more) metrical phrases or *cola* by a break called a *caesura* if it falls within a foot or a *diaeresis* if it falls between feet, though such breaks do not necessarily coincide with a pause in sense. The

¹⁰¹ Contrast the corresponding Greek verse, also composed of six iambs but structured around three units (metra) of the shape $\times - \sim -$. It is therefore called a trimeter.

normal place for this break in the following schemata is indicated by a double line (||).

The final syllable of a colon within a line is often permitted to be either heavy or light, but not 'resolved' into two lights. That position is then *indifferens*. A light syllable often occupies the final position in the line, because the strong metrical boundary there makes a light syllable feel heavy (*brevis in longo*).¹⁰²

Verses with a strong sense-pause at the end, commonly marked in modern texts by a period, colon, or semicolon, are said to be end-stopped. When the sense continues on from one line to the next without significant pause, the lines are said to be enjambed.

The metres of *Hecyra* are schematized below using the following symbols to denote the constituent syllables:

- ∪ brevis
- longum, i.e. — or ∪∪
- × aniceps, i.e. ∪ or — (or, with a 'resolved' longum, ∪∪)
- ⌒ brevis in longo, i.e. — or ∪
- ⊃ indifferens, i.e. ∪ or — (but *not* ∪∪)

5.3.1. Iambic patterns

A. The *iambic senarius* (ia⁶)

× — × — × || — × — × — ∪ ⌒

Add two iambs to the front, and the result is an eight-foot line,

B. The *iambic octonarius* (ia⁸)

× — × — × — × — × || — × — × — ∪ ⌒

If, instead of the usual caesura in the fifth foot of an octonarius, the line includes a colon boundary after the fourth foot (diaeresis), the two cola are treated as metrically identical, i.e.

× — × — × — ∪ ⌒ || × — × — × — ∪ ⌒

A 'catalectic' version of this line, i.e. an octonarius lacking its final syllable, is

C. The *iambic septenarius* (ia⁷)

× — × — × — ∪ ⌒ || × — × — × — ∪

In this pattern, a colon boundary after the fourth foot is the norm and the final syllable becomes *indifferens*.

In addition to these regular iambic patterns, *Hecyra* has iambic dimeters, i.e. two units of two iambs each, at 621 and 731, which scan like the last four feet of the iambic octonarius.

¹⁰² *brevis in longo* may also be found at the end of half-lines or at other colon boundaries within the line (the so-called *loci Jacobsohniani*).

5.3.2. *Trochaic patterns*A. The *trochaic octonarius* (tr⁸)
$$- \times - \times - \times - \asymp || - \times - \times - \times - \asymp$$

In this pattern, diaeresis after the fourth foot normally creates two metrically identical cola. Eliminating the final syllable creates a catalectic version of this verse that is the most common trochaic pattern in comedy, namely

B. The *trochaic septenarius* (tr⁷)
$$- \times - \times - \times - \asymp || - \times - \times - \cup \bar{\lambda}$$

Here the first colon is identical to the octonarius, but the seventh foot must be a pure trochee and the final heavy syllable can be replaced by a *brevis in longo*.

In addition to these regular patterns, there are trochaic dimeters, i.e. two units of two trochees each, at 520 and 850, which again scan like the corresponding octonarius.

5.4. *Interpretive challenges*

Characterizing verse in terms of its feet is a practice deeply rooted in antiquity, as Ovid attests with his famous joke about Cupid turning the poet's hexameters to elegiacs by stealing a foot.¹⁰³ Yet metricians since antiquity have also recognized that no fundamental difference distinguishes iambic from trochaic sequences. The great eighteenth-century scholar Richard Bentley, whose essay 'De metris Terentianis ΣΧΕΔΙΑΣΜΑ' provided the first coherent modern account of Latin dramatic metre, illustrated this fact with an English example of what in Latin terms would be called a trochaic septenarius:¹⁰⁴

Háppy is the COUNTRY life, blest with content, good héalth an' ease.

Add a single syllable to the front, Bentley notes, and the line becomes an iambic octonarius:¹⁰⁵

Thrice háppy is the COUNTRY life, blest with content, good héalth an' ease.

¹⁰³ Ov. *Am.* 1.1.4 [Cupido] *dicatur atque unum surripuisse pedem*. The joke is all the more striking since no metrician would describe the resulting pentameter as a catalectic hexameter. A similar reference to feet as the characterizing unit of verse informs Cicero's discussions of metre, e.g. *Orat.* 173, 218; *Tusc.* 2.37.

¹⁰⁴ The English stress marks, following Bentley's example, indicate the start of every second trochee. The essay introduced his groundbreaking 1726 edition of Terence. This essential fact of iambo-trochaic verse was well known to imperial grammarians like Caesius Bassus (*GLK* vi.250).

¹⁰⁵ T. does precisely this at *Hec.* 754–5, where elimination of a syllable changes an iambic octonarius to a trochaic septenarius. The entire scene 727–67 explores the flexibility of such rhythmic shifts, a noteworthy feature of T.'s metrical practice (Braun 1970: 70–2).

Division into feet also distracts attention from the characteristic cretic rhythm (— ∪ —) that ends not only the iambic senarius and octonarius, but the trochaic septenarius, too. The pattern is so well established that when one of these lines ends with an iambic word, dramatists regularly avoided preceding that word with another pure iamb, since the resulting cadence (× — ∪ — | ∪ —) would produce a cretic rhythm one foot too soon.¹⁰⁶

Clearly, a system of analysis that obscures such basic facts of metrical practice will not tell us all we might like to know about dramatic verse. Modern scholars thus increasingly prefer an algebraic notation for verse structure that focuses on syllables rather than feet. Under this scheme, the iambic senarius and trochaic septenarius are represented by the sequences

$$\begin{array}{c} A B C D A / B C D A B c D \\ B C D A B C D A / B C D A B c D \end{array}$$

where A's and C's are the *incipitia* of traditional analysis, B's and D's the *longa*, lower case letters indicate light syllables (and resolutions), and a forward slash marks significant word divisions.¹⁰⁷ The structural similarity and final cretic cadence of the two metres then become obvious at a glance.

Yet even this approach obscures something important. Bentley's example of metrical flexibility is especially telling because he probably knew 'Happy is the Country Life' not as a poem but as a song: behind all questions of dramatic metre lies the fact of dramatic music.¹⁰⁸ From the audience's standpoint, the most obvious defining fact of dramatic verse is not apparent from scansion alone. The iambic senarius was a spoken verse. Everything else was performed to the tibia, either sung or in recitative. What we are reading were the words of a song, and that matters.¹⁰⁹ On a purely textual level, song lyrics seem to behave like any other verse. Consider, for example, W. S. Gilbert's Duke of Plaza Toro:

In enterprise of martial kind, when there was any fighting,
He led his regiment from behind, he found it less exciting.

¹⁰⁶ The practice is known as 'Luchs's Law'. The linguistic basis for this and related practices are examined by Fortson 2008: 34–53. See also Gratwick 1993: 56–7, Barsby 1999: 302–3.

¹⁰⁷ The iambic sequence of *Hecyra* 58 would then be represented as A B C D A / bb c D aa B c D. For the system, see Gratwick 1993: 52–4, Barsby 1999: 303–4, Fortson 2008: 25–30.

¹⁰⁸ The lyric by John Playford (1623–1686) was widely distributed together with a musical setting in vol. iv of the popular anthology, *Wit and Mirth: or Pills to purge Melancholy* (1719). For the influence of English lyric on Bentley's metrical analysis, see Haugen 2011: 178–81.

¹⁰⁹ For the distinction between spoken and accompanied verse, see Moore 2008, and for the difference music makes between even such structurally close forms as septenarius and senarius, Moore 2012: 172–7.

The English stress accents form the equivalent of an iambic septenarius, with diaeresis after the fourth foot and one strategic resolution in the second line:

$\cup - | \cup - | \cup - | \cup - || \cup - | \cup - | \cup - x$
 $\cup - | \cup \cup | \cup - | \cup - || \cup - | \cup - | \cup - x$

Reading these lines ‘metrically’, however, creates a very distorted view of what an audience actually hears. Sullivan’s melody, in 2/4 time, actually spreads the opening monosyllable of each verse over two semiquavers (sixteenth-notes) sung a third apart, ‘any’ in the first line is sung as four sixteenth-notes, with two notes for each syllable, and the rhythm is not in fact dotted, the musical equivalent of iambs, but a long string of unaccented eighth-notes (quavers). And at the finale, nothing in the lyric when printed as text indicates that the culminating praise of that ‘celebrated, cultivated, underrated nobleman’ is in double time. Gilbert, working in partnership with Sullivan, doubtless knew what the music would do, but his words alone do not give an entirely accurate idea of how the verse is performed. So how can we understand Terentian verse, since T. had his Flaccus, but the tibicen’s contribution does not survive?

The first step is to recognize not just that this is musical theatre, but that the music matters to the theatre. T. is not as spectacular a writer of lyric as Plautus: he does not create complex arias (*cantica*) of the Plautine type. Yet he is in his own way a highly skilled manipulator of metrical and musical effects, and *Hecyra* is his most musical play.¹¹⁰ What this may mean is best shown by example. At 516 Myrrina rushes from her house in great distress because her husband has stumbled upon the first half of the play’s great secret. She sings in trochaic octonarii:

Perii! quid agam? quo me uortam? quid uiro mēo respondebo?
 $\cup \cup - | \cup \cup - | - - | - - || - \cup | - - | - - | - -$
 bbC / d d A / B C D A || B c D A / B C D A

Her discrete exclamations are punctuated by metrical boundaries, the agitated anapaests of the first two set in contrast to the spondees of the last in a lengthening tricolon of despair. The corresponding sense boundaries imply pauses after each unit. What does the tibicen do at these points? A musical rest at these verbal silences creates a more natural effect; brief arpeggios between them might encourage a more stylized delivery. And does the musical phrase repeat note for note, or does the pitch rise with the emotion? We cannot know, but attention to the scansion at least enables us to recognize these possibilities and, in the process,

¹¹⁰ About 56% of *Hec.* is accompanied by the tibia. No other play exceeds the 48% of *An.* (According to Moore 2007: 93 n. 1–2, the corresponding figure is 68% for the entire Plautine corpus, with a high of 79% for *Epidicus*.) The only passages in T. not iambo-trochaic are *An.* 481–4, 625–38 and *Ad.* 610–17.

to see the dramatist working in partnership with actor and tibicen to create more than verbal effects alone.¹¹¹

To facilitate such recognition, our text identifies in the margin the metrical structure of each line and marks prosodic features like iambic shortening and synizesis to encourage scansion.¹¹² The diacritical marks used for this purpose are:

- over a non-elided vowel or diphthong (**hiatus**)
 e.g. *Hecyra est huic nomen fabulae. haec quom datast*
 over a short vowel lengthened at the end of a colon (**brevis in longo**)
 e.g. *nouā, nouom interuenit uitium*
- ⌣ over a non-elided vowel in **prosodic hiatus**
 e.g. *ita me dī amabunt*
 over a vowel affected by **iambic shortening**
 e.g. *quid petam meā causa; uel hīc Pamphilus iurabat*
- ˙ indicating an unpronounced final *e* or *s* (**apocope**)
 e.g. *Philoti˙, salue multum*
 indicating an otherwise ambiguous result of **apocope** and **prodelision**
 e.g. *quid exanimatu˙s obsecro*
- ⌢ indicating vowels merged by **synizesis**
 e.g. *despondit ei˘ gnatam*

Noteworthy points of prosody are discussed in the commentary, as are some of the more obvious examples of metrical manipulation for dramatic effect. More of these remain to be discovered, though much is of necessity unknown and probably unknowable. We are in effect flying blind, but with certain safeguards in place, that is much better than not flying at all.

6. DONATUS

In addition to the *Ars grammatica* that became a standard text of the Middle Ages, the great fourth-century grammarian Aelius Donatus wrote extensive commentaries on the two most important poets of the Latin curriculum, Virgil and Terence.¹¹³ Neither commentary survives in its original form. That on Virgil was

¹¹¹ So Cic. *De Orat.* 3.102 speaks of the three types of expertise combining to control the tone and pace of the performance. Moore 2012: 135–9 and Marshall 2006: 234–44 examine the partnership required between tibicen and actors. How fully our texts reflect the actual rhythms of performance is unclear; Moore 2012: 144–70 analyses the possibilities. For a more optimistic view, at least in the Greek context, of the relationship of text to accompaniment, see Dale 1969: 160–4, West 1982: 20–2.

¹¹² Prosodic indications in the text generally follow those of Lindsay's OCT. Alternative scansions are occasionally indicated in the commentary. When reading aloud, it often helps simply to be sensitive to vowel quantity and to observe Latin's characteristic stress accent. The natural rhythm of each line then tends to emerge on its own.

¹¹³ His student Jerome set Don.'s *floruit* at 353 CE. For his career, see Kaster 1988: 275–8, and for his style of exegesis, Zetzel 1981: 148–67, Jakobi 1996. Barsby 2000 provides a helpful overview.

eclipsed within a century by the work of Servius, who appropriated much of its content. The T. commentary suffered a different fate. Extracts from it were over time copied into the margins of the dramatist's MSS and eventually replaced the continuous commentary from which they were drawn; only some centuries later was an effort made to reconstitute those marginalia once again as a separate book. The *Commentum Terentii* we know today is thus not the work as Don. wrote it but an anonymous, undated compilation of disparate fragments and presumed fragments of the lost original, with extraneous material from other sources quite possibly added to the mix as well.¹¹⁴ Yet for all the resulting inconsistencies, repetitions, contradictions, and frustrations, what remains of Don.'s great work has shaped the course of Terentian studies for the better part of two millennia. Many of its insights have long since passed into the vast realm of received opinion, but commentaries – including this one – continue to be in its debt. It is therefore important to understand what information ascribed to 'Don.' in the following notes does and does not represent.

First some negatives. Don. did not work in a vacuum. Like all commentators, he borrowed from previous commentators. Sometimes he even says as much. So, for example, on a question of attribution in *Ad.*, 'Probus assigns this to the character of Sostrata; Asper does not want the slave to respond to everything, but thinks the nurse says this.'¹¹⁵ So, too, on a seemingly minor change at *Hec.* 440:

imperite Terentium de Myconio crispum dixisse aiunt, cum Apollodorus caluum dixerit, quod proprium Myconiis est, ut Lucilius 'Myconi calua omnis iuuentus'; unde etiam prouerbiū Graecum 'μία Μύκωνος'. sed ego Terentium puto scientem facetius Myconium crispum dixisse.

They say that T. ignorantly called a Mykonian 'curly-haired', although Apollodorus said 'bald', which suits people from Mykonos, as Lucilius, 'The whole youth of Mykonos is bald'; from which sentiment comes the Greek proverb 'Mykonos is all one.' I think, though, that T. knowingly said 'curly-haired Mykonian' as a joke.

¹¹⁴ The compilation is unlikely to have occurred before the seventh century, though all the witnesses are significantly later. Some forty Italian MSS of the fifteenth century preserve the reconstituted commentary on five of the six plays (*Hau.* is missing). Two older, partial witnesses of the thirteenth and eleventh centuries also survive. For the complexities of the resulting text history, see Reeve 1983a, Grant 1986: 60–77. The standard edition of Don. remains Wessner 1902–8, though a replacement has long been desired. Material from Don.'s lost commentary on Virgil may survive in the augmented version of Servius known as Servius Danielis (Cameron 2011: 408–13).

¹¹⁵ Don. ad *Ad.* 323, *Probus personae assignat hoc Sostratae, Asper non uult ad omnia seruum respondere, sed nutricem putat hoc loqui.* Aemilius Asper commented astutely on T., Sallust, and Virgil in the second century CE. M. Valerius Probus, the great scholar of Flavian Rome, made a special study of (then unfashionable) Republican authors (Suet. *Gram.* 24, with Kaster 1995: 242–66). Much of Don.'s Republican material may derive from him, though Don. also cites the antiquarian P. Nigidius Figulus, a contemporary of Varro (ad *Ph.* 233). For his explicit references to T.'s Greek models, see Sandbach 1978, Barsby 2000: 497–502.

This note is especially significant since it not only shows Don. thinking for himself but, when taken in conjunction with similar observations, strongly suggests that both his occasional quotations from Menander and Apollodorus and his comments on their dramaturgy derive not from first-hand knowledge of the relevant Greek texts but from more knowledgeable predecessors. Don. was not himself as preoccupied with T.'s relation to the Greek originals as some of his modern heirs have been. In Latin textual matters, his testimony is rarely decisive, though it can be helpful (e.g. ad *Hec.* 64, 266). He sometimes discusses textual variants or quotes a somewhat different text from ours. Close analysis has shown that the text he used must have been independent of the two surviving manuscript families that form the modern text of T., but although an independent witness to what T. wrote, it was not for that reason necessarily a better one.¹¹⁶

As an interpreter, Don. shows wide interests, though he is inclined toward the rhetorical constructions that characterize so much ancient scholarship.¹¹⁷ He eagerly notes figures at work, for example, ranging from the obvious (ITA ME DI BENE AMENT: ἄτεχνος πίστις *per iusiurandum*, 206) to the more advanced (POST MODO RESCISCES: *haec figura ab oratoribus ἐπαγγελία nominatur, in qua aliquid promittimus iudicibus nos probaturos*, 208) to the limits of the probable (QUAE VOBIS FLACITA EST CONDICIO DATUR: *imago hic quaedam argumentationis, quae dicitur ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὅχι τέλους, quod Latine dicitur ab initio ad finem*, 241). Terentian parallels are often quite aptly cited (e.g. 225, 244), but a very narrow focus (perhaps heightened by the vagaries of his abridgement) can lead, especially when citing other authors, to disconcerting juxtapositions, as when he glosses Pamphilus' reluctance to marry (*ille inuitus illam duxerat, Hec.* 142) with Aeneas' last words to Dido (*Italiam non sponte sequor, Aen.* 4.361). He is most consistently helpful for appreciating nuances of word choice and characterization. The help can be simple, e.g. *adprime* means *vehementissime* (ad 247) and *se duxit* is a colloquial equivalent to *abiit* (ad 522), or precise to the point of pedantry, e.g. that *operā* denotes harm done knowingly, *culpā* if done in ignorance (ad 228). Other observations are more subtle, e.g. the wittiness at 84 of asking a *meretrix* not 'Where have you been?' (*ubi fuisti?*) but 'Where have you been amusing yourself?' (*ubi te oblectasti?*).¹¹⁸

Don. may also display real power of imagination and a lively intellect. That should not surprise us. Jerome never forgot the dry wit his teacher brought to the classroom, as when he glossed T.'s observation *nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius* (*Eu.* 41) with the remark, *pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt*, precisely the kind of comment to stick in the mind of a precocious student.¹¹⁹ Similarly shrewd

¹¹⁶ Grant 1986: 77–96, Jakobi 1999: 18–46.

¹¹⁷ Jakobi 1996: 133–43.

¹¹⁸ Don. calls ἰδιωτισμός both characterizing speech (Jakobi 1996: 125–7) and colloquial speech (Ferri and Probert 2010: 31–8).

¹¹⁹ Jer. *In Eccles.* 1. The comment does not appear in the extant commentary: the anecdote as told clearly suggests an informal moment. So, rightly, Kaster 1988: 277.

observations of all kinds are found in the commentary. What may sound like a narrow technical point may have dramatic significance, as when he endorses the scansion *minime equidem mē oblectauī* (85), i.e. hiatus rather than elision, because *me* here answers *te* in 84 and must be clearly heard. He thinks seriously about the function of monologues (e.g. ad 274) and the motivation of characters (e.g. ad 359, 873). He is also well aware that stage action and delivery affect meaning, though whether a comment like ‘Pamphilus says this grimly and with affected sadness’ derives from a memory of stage performance or dramatic reading, a classroom exercise, or simply his own active imagination is impossible to determine.¹²⁰ Don.’s own rhetorical training would have alerted him to the importance of gesture and expression in performance, and that critical orientation probably underlies other observations about delivery, such as *in qua plus uultu significatur quam uerbis* and *in gestu ac uultu id quod restat ostenditur*.¹²¹ An interest in performance, in bringing these plays to some kind of life, was itself part of Don’s own tradition of explication.

7. TEXT

The text of T. followed two discernible routes to the modern world. Our sole witness to the first of these is itself ancient, the so-called Codex Bembinus, a MS of the fourth or fifth century CE now in the Vatican library.¹²² This venerable parchment book, written in rustic capitals, preserves T. in the form that Don., Servius, and Macrobius would have known. Though it lost a few folios in the course of time – *Hecyra* 1–37 is among the missing bits – it remains the single best witness to what T. wrote. A second route to survival was independent of A and is much better attested. As many as 700 medieval MSS of T., all written in minuscule script, share a common ancestor now lost (Σ) and are known collectively as the Calliopian family because several of them acknowledge in a subscript the editorial intervention of an otherwise unknown scholar they call Calliopius.¹²³ We take A and Σ to represent different branches of the tradition because A preserves

¹²⁰ Don. ad 468 *Pamphilus uultuose et cum supercilii tristitia hoc dicit*, with a very similar comment ad Ph. 184. Still more precise instructions regarding delivery are also found, e.g. ad *Eu.* 379.4 and 530. See Barsby 2000: 511–13, and more broadly Thomadaki 1989: 368–72, Jakobi 1996: 8–14. cf. *Hec.* 74n.

¹²¹ Don. ad *Eu.* 499 and 523 respectively. For *gestus* and *uultus* in delivery, cf. Cic. *De Orat.* 3.220–1, Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.65–81, and for the relationship of oratorical to theatrical practice, Fantham 2002.

¹²² The Bembinus (Vat. lat. 3226), conventionally identified as A in a critical apparatus, takes its name from the Bembo family of Venetian humanists, who owned it from some time in the fifteenth century until 1579. It was willed to the Vatican library by Fulvio Orsini in 1600. A facsimile is available: Prete 1970.

¹²³ The subscription reads *Calliopius recensuit* (t) or *feliciter Calliopio bono scholastico*. He is no. 194 in the prosopography of Kaster 1988: 388–9. Scholarly convention identifies extant MSS by Roman letters and lost MSS from which they are descended by Greek ones.

readings not found in any descendant of Σ and presents the plays in a different order, but the MSS of the extensive Calliopian family are not all closely related to each other. Σ had two descendants that are themselves now lost, Γ and Δ , each of which produced a sub-group in the Calliopian line.¹²⁴ Surviving MSS either derive directly from one or the other of these two or are judged to form a third, 'mixed' group representing a contamination of the two traditions. The readings in this large family of MSS vary in quality – no Calliopian MS is as consistently good a witness as A – but they include another noteworthy feature: several of those descended from Γ contain lively miniature illustrations depicting the plays' characters and sometimes stage action.¹²⁵

As a group, the MSS of T. share two striking features. First, they do not uniformly recognize that the plays are in verse, much less indicate the various kinds of verse. The Bembinus distinguishes accurately between *senarii* and accompanied metres, but the Calliopian family is inconsistent. Some of those MSS get things right or largely right, but the ninth-century C (Vat. lat. 3868), which is in other respects among the finest of them, treats the text largely as prose. In another important way, though, all MSS of T. accurately reflect an original Roman practice: they do not have act divisions. The act structure generally found in our printed texts was imposed by Renaissance editors, who knew on Horace's authority that a play should have five acts, though they must also have known – as ancient commentators like Don. certainly knew – that no five-act structure suits these plays very well.¹²⁶ Though their Greek models were certainly organized in acts punctuated by independent choral interludes, the Roman preference for continuous action led authors of *palliata* comedies to work around the resulting breaks in the original action.¹²⁷ The structural unit that mattered to them was instead the scene as defined by the characters' entrances, and our MSS

¹²⁴ So, e.g., while A preserves the plays in the order *An., Eu., Hau., Ph., Hec., Ad.*, the Γ -subgroup of the Calliopian family reverses *Ph.* and *Ad.*, while the Δ -subgroup presents them in alphabetical order, with *Ph.* = F.

¹²⁵ The most beautifully illustrated of the Calliopian MSS, the ninth-century Vat. lat. 3868, has been published in facsimile: Jachmann 1929. A twelfth-century version in Oxford (Bodleian MS. Auct. F.2.13) is available, along with full discussion and supplementary material, as a DVD edited by B. J. Muir and A. J. Turner, Bodleian Digital Texts 2. The miniatures as a group are reproduced and discussed by Jones and Morey 1931. Their origin, their relation to one another, and especially their relation to actual stage performance of whatever time remain controversial. See Dodwell 2000, Lateiner 2004, Wright 2006, Deutsch 2007.

¹²⁶ Hor. *Ep.* 2.3.189–90 *neu minor neu sit quinto productior actu | fabula*, a case where Hellenistic literary theory did not fit Roman literary practice. Thus Don. Praef. ad *An.* II.3 *difficile est diuisionem actuum in Latinis fabulis internoscere obscure editam* (cf. Praef. ad *Eu.* I.5). See Hunter 1985: 35–42, Brink 1971: 248–50, Duckworth 1952: 98–101.

¹²⁷ The clearest example is the scene at Pl. *Bac.* 494–562, which smoothes over the choral interlude at Men. *Dis exapaton* 59–63. See Introduction 1.3. Traces of the original act divisions discernible in Latin texts furnish important clues for reconstructing their lost models, e.g. Gaiser 1972: 1038–41, Lowe 1983.

consistently mark scene divisions by setting out before each one the names and roles of the characters to appear in it.

Constructing a modern text from this material is no simple matter. The exact relation of individual Calliopian MSS to each other and to their ancestors remains controversial, as does the quality of their testimony and the degree of credence a modern editor should give it.¹²⁸ Nor is it right to assume at points of uncertainty or conflict that the oldest MS (A) necessarily preserves the correct reading. Two small examples illustrate the nature of the editor's task.

(a) At *Hecyra* 337, Sostrata says, *male metuo ne Philumena magis morbus adgrauascat* ('I'm very afraid that Philumena's illness is getting much worse'). A few MSS, however, read *adgrauascat*, a spelling also found in almost all MSS of the fourth-century grammarian Nonius Marcellus, quoting a line from a tragedy by Pacuvius, *ubi ego me grauidam sentio adgrauascare* ('When I felt myself growing heavy . . .'). Is that less common spelling therefore preferable? Probably not. Though Latin produces a few inchoative verbs in *-āscō*, e.g. *irascor* (from *iratus*), *uesperasco* (from *uesper*), they more commonly derive from *ē*-stems, e.g. *calēscere* from *calēre*. Even the inchoative of *creāre* is *crescere*, and *grauis* produces *grauescere*. The intensified form at *Hec.* 337 is unlikely to be exceptional: *adgrauascat* in MSS of T. (like *adgrauascare* in Nonius) is probably an error, not a *lectio difficilior* that belongs in the text.¹²⁹

(b) There are also indirect witnesses to the text, such as ancient marginal notes (scholia) and corrections in A and comments in Don. on variant readings, that sometimes identify or suggest an answer to a textual problem. At *Hec.* 313, for example, *fortasse unum aliquod uerbum inter eas iram hanc concuiisse* ('perhaps just a single word stirred up this bad feeling between them'), A originally read *concluserit* but was corrected to *conciuiisset*, Σ read *conciuerit*, and Don., whose own text read *consciuerit*, notes an alternative reading *consciuisse*. Modern editors, recognizing that *fortasse* is constructed with an infinitive in Pl. (e.g. *Epid.* 296, *Merc.* 782, *Truc.* 680) tease out from this testimony the correct verb (*concieo*) in the correct form (perf. inf.) and amend accordingly.¹³⁰

Happily, the textual problems confronting editors of *Hecyra* rarely run deeper than these and do not seriously compromise our understanding of the play's action or its significance. Yet in producing a text, an editor cannot avoid confronting and passing judgment on each discrepancy or inadequacy in the

¹²⁸ Reeve 1983b and Barsby 1999: 29–32 survey the MS tradition. The most thorough study of it to date remains Grant 1986, but discoveries continue to be made, e.g. Victor 2007a. Three fragments of T. found on papyri of the IV–V centuries cē have produced no significant improvement in the text. For these, see the addendum to the OCT preface by Skutsch (1957).

¹²⁹ Pace Victor 2007a: 5–6. For the forms, see Hocquard 1981: 348–51, Weiss 2009: 407. Pacuvius' verbal play on *grauidam* . . . *adgrauascare* – the context is pregnancy, not illness – may have encouraged the aberrant spelling.

¹³⁰ The text of Don. at this point may itself represent an amalgam of disparate sources (so Grant 1986: 71–2), but its clues are helpful despite their dubious pedigree.

sources. To what end? What is the text an edition aspires to present to modern readers? Some perspective may help. The origins of our surviving witnesses, A and Σ, have never been traced any further back than Flavian times, i.e. still nearly three hundred years after the playwright's death,¹³¹ nor were they the only witnesses to what T. wrote still available in late antiquity.¹³² The process of transmission from the original creation of a script in the 160s BCE for (and by) Ambivius Turpio's acting troupe to what Flavian scholars may have found under T.'s name to what we know today as the text of *Hecyra* is thus nearly as problematic in outline as in detail. That should not surprise us. Editors of Shakespeare continue to debate whether Hamlet's flesh was too solid, sallied, or sullied, and we will never be able to say with any more certainty whether T. initially wrote *adgrauascat* or *adgrauescat*, much less what his actor may have said on the stage in any one performance or what members of his audience thought they heard. Behind the eventual text lies, ultimately, the record of performance, and 'if', as current thinking runs, 'it is a performing text we are dealing with, it is a mistake to think that in our editorial work what we are doing is getting back to the author's original manuscript: the very notion of "the author's original manuscript" is in such cases a figment'.¹³³ Getting as close as we can to what subsequent Roman readers eventually knew as 'Terence' is about the best we can do, but that, as will emerge, turns out to be an entirely adequate approximation.

The approximation to T.'s original *Hecyra* that accompanies this commentary does not represent a new critical edition, and attentive readers will note only a few significant departures from the Oxford text of Kauer and Lindsay:

208 *scio* retained for Sostrata

557 *solum solus* for *solu' solum*

791 bracketed

880 *plaudite* retained for Parmeno

¹³¹ Jachmann claimed a common ancestor for A and Σ, which he called Φ and believed to derive from an edition of T. by the late first-century grammarian Valerius Probus (Jachmann 1924: 87–90, Grant 1986: 5–10). Jachmann's hypothesis, however, has not gone unchallenged (Victor 1996, Reeve 2000: 198), and the very idea of an ancient 'edition' as he imagined it is now seen to be problematic (Zetzel 1981: 43–54 and Kaster 1995: 242–50 on the work of Probus).

¹³² Thus the editor of P. Oxy. 2401, two leaves of *An.* from a codex roughly contemporary with A, suspects its 'detachment from our MS transmission'. For the independence of Don.'s text of T., see above, n. 116.

¹³³ Orgel 1991: 84, in the context of Renaissance drama. See also Marshall 2006: 257–61, though Vickers 2002: 18–43 points with some truth to scripts as 'the single most important thing in mounting a play'. As for the famous crux at *Hamlet* 1.2, the earlier quartos (1603, 1604) read 'sallied', i.e. either 'assailed' or the equivalent of 'sullied', while the magisterial folio of 1623 reads 'solid'. No editorial choice is universally accepted. Questa 1965: 33–4 n. 31 notes similar, performance-based variations in the history of opera librettos. The MSS of *Hec.* may preserve such a variant at 790–1.

These variations, along with other interpretive questions rooted in problems of text and metre, are discussed in the commentary. Punctuation has been modernized throughout to reflect current usage, though Latin syntax is not always easy to align with English practice. Lindsay's diacritical aids to scansion are reproduced in hope of encouraging attention to metre, and I have preserved the traditional act and scene numbers in the outside margin for ease of reference. Line numbering, however, is continuous.

P. TERENCEI AFRI HECYRA

DIDASCALIA I (*SECVNDVM* Α)

INCIPIT TERENCEI HECYRA : ACTA LVDIS MEGALENSIBVS SEXTO IVLIO CAESARE CN. CORNELIO DOLABELLA AEDILIBVS CVRVLIBVS : MODOS FECIT FLACCVS CLAVDI TIBIIS PARIBVS TOTA : GRAECA MENANDRV : FACTA EST V : ACTA PRIMO SINE PROLOGO DATA : SECVNDO CN. OCTAVIO TITO MANLIO COS : RELATA EST LVCIO AEMILIO PAVLO LVDIS FVNERALIBVS : NON EST PLACITA : TERTIO RELATA EST Q. FVLVIO LVC. MARCIO AEDILIBVS CVRVLIBVS : EGIT LVC AMBIVIVS LVC SERGIVS TVRPIO : PLACVIT

DIDASCALIA II (*SECVNDVM* Σ)

INCIPIT <TERENTI> HECYRA : ACTA LVDIS ROMANIS SEX IVL CAES CN CORNELIO AEDILIBVS CVRVLIBVS : NON EST PERACTA : MODOS FECIT FLACCVS CLAVDI TIBIIS PARILIBVS TOTA : CN OCTAVIO T MANLIO COS RELATA EST ITERUM L AEMILIO PAVLO LVDIS FVNEBRIS : RELATA EST TERTIO Q. FVLVIO L MARTIO AEDIL CVRVL

PERSONAE

PROLOGVS

PHILOTIS MERETRIX

SYRA ANVS

PARMENO SERVOS

(SCIRTVS SERVOS)

LACHES SENEX

SOSTRATA MATRONA

PHIDIPPVS SENEX

PAMPHILVS ADVLESCENS

SOSIA SERVOS

MYRRINA MATRONA

BACCHIS MERETRIX

PROLOGVS I

*ia*⁶ Hecyra est huic nomen fabulae. haec quom datast
noua, nouom interuenit uitium et calamitas
ut neque spectari neque cognosci potuerit:
ita populu' studio stupidus in funambulo
animum occuparat. nunc haec planest pro noua, 5
et is qui scripsit hanc ob eam rem noluit
iterum referre ut iterum possit uendere.
alias cognostis eiu'; quaeso hanc noscite.

PROLOGVS II

Orator ad uos uenio ornatu prologi:
sinite exorator sim eodem ut iure uti senem 10
liceat quo iure sum usus adulescentior,
nouas qui exactas feci ut inueterascerent,
ne cum poeta scriptura euanesceret.
in eis quas primum Caecili didici nouas
partim sum earum exactu', partim uix steti. 15
quia scibam dubiam fortunam esse scaenicam,
spe incerta certum mihi laborem sustuli:
easdem agere coepi ut ab eodem alias discerem
nouas, studiose ne illum ab studio abducerem.
perfeci ut spectarentur: ubi sunt cognitae, 20
placitae sunt. ita poetam restitui in locum
prope iam remmotum iniuria aduorsarium
ab studio atque ab labore atque arte musica.
quod si scripturam spreuissem in praesentia
et in deterrendo uoluisssem operam sumere, 25
deterruissem facile ne alias scriberet.
nunc quid petam mea causa aequo animo attendite.
Hecyram ad uos refero, quam mihi per silentium
numquam agere licitumst: ita eam oppressit calamitas. 30
eam calamitatem uostra intellegentia
sedabit, si erit adiutrix nostrae industriae.
quom primum eam agere coepi, pugilum gloria
(funambuli eodem accessit expectatio),
comitum conuentu', strepitu', clamor mulierum 35

fecere ut ante tempus exirem foras.
uetere in noua coepi uti consuetudine
in experiundo ut essem; refero denuo.
primo actu placeo; quom interea rumor uenit
datum iri gladiatores, populu' conuolat, 40
tumultuantur clamant, pugnant de loco:
ego ĩnterea meũm non potui tutari locum.
nunc turba nulla est: otium et silentiumst:
agendi tempu' mihi datumst; uobis datur
potestas condecorandi ludos scaenicos. 45
nolite sinere per uos artem musicam
recidere ad paucos: facite ut uostra auctoritas
meae aũctoritati fautrix adiutrixque sit.
si numquam auare pretium statui arti meae
et eum ěsse quaestum in animum induxi maximum 50
quam maxume seruire uostris commodis,
sinite impetrare me, qui in tutelam meam
studium suom et se in uostram commisit fidem,
ne ěum circumuentum inique iniqui inrideant.
meã causa causam accipite et date silentium, 55
ut lubeat scribere aliis mihique ut discere
nouas expediat posthac pretio emptas meo.

I.i: PHILOTIS SYRA

*ia*⁶ PH. Per pol quam paucos reperias meretricibus
 fidelis euenire amatores, Syra.
 uel hīc Pamphilus iurabat quotiens Bacchidi, 60
 quam sancte, uti quiuis facile posset credere,
 numquam illa uiua ducturum uxorem domum:
 em duxit! SY. ergo propterea te sedulo
 et moneo et hortor ne quouisquam misereat,
 quin spolies mutiles laceres quemque nacta sis. 65
 PH. utine eximium neminem habeam? SY. neminem:
 nam nemo illorum quisquam, scito, ad te uenit
 quin ita paret sese abs te ut blanditiis suis
 quam minimo pretio sūam uoluptatem expleat.
 hiscin tu amabo non contra insidiabere? 70
 PH. tamen pol eandem iniuriumst esse omnibus.
 SY. iniurium autem est ulcisci aduorsarios,
 aut qua uia te captent eādem ipsos capi?
 eheu me miseram, quor non aut istaec mihi
 aetas et formast aut tibi haec sententia? 75

I.ii: PARMENO PHILOTIS SYRA

*ia*⁶ PA. Senex si quaeret me, modo isse dicito
 ad portum percontatum aduentum Pamphili.
 audin quid dicam, Scirte? si quaeret me, uti
 tum dicas; si non quaeret, nullu' dixeris,
 alias ut uti possim causa hac integra. 80
 sed uideon ego Philotium? unde haec aduenit?
 Philoti', salue multum. PH. o salue, Parmeno.
 SY. salue mecastor, Parmeno. PA. et tu edepol, Syra.
 dic mi, ubi, Philoti', te oblectasti tam diu?
 PH. minime equidem mē oblectaui, quae cum milite 85
 Corinthum hinc sum profecta inhumanissimo:
 biennium ibi perpetuom misera illum tuli.
 PA. edepol te desiderium Athenarum arbitror,
 Philotium, cepisse saepe et te tuom
 consilium contempsisse. PH. non dici potest 90
 quam cupida eram huc redeundi, abeundi a milite
 uosque hic uidendi, antiqua ut consuetudine
 agitare inter uos libere conuiuium.

nam illi[c] haud licebat nisi praefinito loqui
 quae illi placerent. PA. haud opinor commode 95
 finem statuisset orationi militem.

PH. sed quid hoc negotist? modo quae narrauit mihi
 hic intu' Bacchi?! quod ego numquam credidi
 fore, ut ille hac uiua posset animum inducere
 uxorem habere. PA. habere autem? PH. eho tu, an
 non habet? 100

PA. habet, sed firmas haec uereor ut sint nuptiae.

PH. ita di deaeque faxint, si in rem est Bacchidis.
 sed qui istuc credam ita esse dic mihi, Parmeno.

PA. non est opus prolato hoc: percontarier
 desiste. PH. nempe eâ causa ut ne id fiat palam? 105
 ita me di amabunt, haud propterea te rogo,
 uti hoc proferam, sed ut tacita mecum gaudeam.

PA. numquam tam dices commode ut tergum meum
 tuam in fidem committam. PH. ah noli, Parmeno:
 quasi tu non multo malis narrare hoc mihi 110
 quam ego quae percontor scire. PA. (uera haec
 praedicat
 et illud mihi uitiumst maximum.) si mihi fidem
 das te taciturnam, dicam. PH. ad ingenium redis.
 fidem do: loquere. PA. ausculta. PH. istic sum. PA.
 hanc Bacchidem

amabat ut quom maxime tum Pamphilus 115
 quom pater uxorem ut ducat orare occipit
 et haec communia omnium quae sunt patrum:
 sese senem esse dicere, illum autem unicum,
 praesidium uelle se senectuti suae.

ill' primo se negare; sed postquam acrius 120
 pater instat, fecit animi ut incertus foret
 pudorin an amor obsequeretur magis.
 tundendo atque odio denique effecit senex:
 despondit ei gnatam hui(us) uicini proximi.

usque illud uisum est Pamphilo ne utiquam graue 125
 donec iam in ipsis nuptiis, postquam uidet
 paratas nec moram ullam quin ducat dari,
 ibi demum ita aegre tulit ut ipsam Bacchidem,
 si adesset, credo ibi ei commiseresceret.

ubiquomque datum erat spatium solitudinis 130

ut conloqui mecum una posset: 'Parmeno,
perii, quid ego egi! in quod me conieci malum!
non potero ferre hoc, Parmeno: perii miser.'

*tr*⁷ PH. at te di deaque perduint cum istoc odio, Lache!

*ia*⁶ PA. ut ād pauca redeam, uxorem deducit domum. 135

nocte illa prima uirginem non attigit;
quae consecutast nox eam, nihilo magis.

PH. quid ais? cum uirgine una adulescens cubuerit
plus potu', sese illa abstinere ut potuerit?

non ueri simile dici' neque uerum arbitror. 140

PA. credo ita uideri tibi. nam nemo ad te uenit
nisi cupiens tui; ille inuitus illam duxerat.

PH. quid deinde fit? PA. diebu' sane pauculis
post Pamphilus me solum seducit foras
narratque ut uirgo ab se integra etiam tum siet, 145

seque ante quā eam uxorem duxisset domum,
sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

'sed quam decrerim me non posse diutius
habere, eam ludibrio haberi, Parmeno,
quin integram itidem reddam, ut accepi ab suis, 150

neque honestum mihi neque utile ipsi uirginist.'

PH. pium ac pudicum ingenium narras Pamphili.

PA. 'hoc ego proferre incommodum mi esse arbitror;
reddi patri autem, quoi tu nil dicas uiti,
superbumst. sed illam spero, ubi hoc cognouerit 155

non posse se mecum esse, abituram denique.'

PH. quid interea? ibatne ad Bacchidem? PA. cotidie.

sed ut fit, postquam hunc alienum ab sese uidet,
maligna multo et mage procax facta ilico est.

PH. non edepol mirum. PA. atque ea res multo
maxume 160

diiunxit illum ab illa, postquam et ipse se
et illam et hanc quae domi erat cognouit satis,
ad ēxemplum ambarum mores earum existimans.

haec, ita uti liberali esse ingenio decet,
pudens modesta incommoda atque iniurias
uiri omnis ferre et tegere contumelias. 165

hic animu' partim uxori' misericordia

deuinctu', partim uictus hui(u)s iniuriis

paullatim elapsust Bacchidi atque huc transtulit

amorem, postquam par ingenium nactus est. 170
 interea in Imbro moritur cognatus senex
 horunc: ea ad hos redibat lege hereditas.
 eo amantem inuitum Pamphilum extrudit pater.
 reliquit cum matre hic uxorem; nam senex
 rus abdidit se, huc raro in urbem commeat. 175
 PH. quid adhuc habent infirmitatis nuptiae?
 PA. nunc audies. primo dies complusculos
 bene conuenibat sane inter eas. interim
 miris modis odisse coepit Sostratam:
 neque lites ullae inter eas, postulatio 180
 numquam. PH. quid igitur? PA. siquando ad eam
 accesserat
 confabulatum, fugere e conspectu ilico,
 uidere nolle: denique ubi non quit pati,
 simulat se ad matrem accersi ad rem diuinam, abit.
 ubi illic diēs est compluris, accersi iubet: 185
 dixere causam tum nescioquam. iterum iubet:
 nemo remisit. postquam accersunt saepius,
 aegram esse simulant mulierem. nostra ilico
 it uisere ad eam: admisit nemo. hoc ubi senex
 rescuiuit, heri ea causa rure huc aduenit, 190
 patrem continuo conuenit Philuminae.
 quid egerint inter se nondum etiam scio;
 nisi sane curaest quorsum euenturum hoc siet.
 habes omnem rem: pergam quo coepi hoc iter.
 PH. et quidem ego; nam constitui cum quodam
 hospite 195
 me esse illum conuenturam. PA. di uortant bene
 quod agas! PH. uale. PA. et tu bene uale, Philotium.

II.i:

LACHES

SOSTRATA

*ia*⁸ LA. Pro deum ātque hominum fidem, quod hōc genus
 est, quāe haec est coniuratio!
 utin omnes mulieres eadem aequē studeant nolintque
 omnia
 neque declinatam quicquam ab aliarum ingenio ullam
 reperias!

200

*ia*⁶ itaque adeo uno animo omnes socrūs oderunt nurus.
*ia*⁸ uirīs esse aduersas aequē studiumst, simili⁷ pertinacīast,

- in eodemque omnes mihi uidentur ludo doctae ad
malitiam; et
ēi ludo, si ullus est, magistram hanc esse sati' certo scio.
- ia*⁶ SO. me miseram! quae nunc quā̃m ōb rem accuser
nescio. LA. hem! 205
- ia*⁸ tu nescis? SO. non, ita me di bene ament, mi Lache,
itaque una inter nos agere aetatem liceat. LA. di mala
prohibeant.
SO. meque abs te inmerito esse accusatam post modo
rescises, scio.
LA. te inmerito? an quicquam pro istis factis dignum
te dici potest?
quae mē ēt tē ēt familiam dedecoras, filio luctum
paras; 210
tum autem ex amicis inimici ut sint nobis adfines facis,
qui illum decrerunt dignum sūos quoi liberos
committerent.
tu sola exorere quae perturbes haec tua inpudentia.
SO. egōn? LA. tū īnquam, mulier, quae me omnino
lapidem, non hominem putas.
an, quia ruri esse crebro soleo, nescire arbitramini 215
*ia*⁶ quo quisque pacto hic uitam uostrarum exigit?
*tr*⁷ multo melius hic quae fiunt quam illi[c] ubi sum
adsidue scio,
ideo quia, ūt uos mihi domi eriti', proinde ego ero
fama foris.
iampridem equidem audiui cepisse odium tui
Philumenam,
minimeque adeo [est] mirum, et nī īd fecisset mage
mirum foret; 220
sed non credidi adeo ut etiam totam hanc odisset
domum:
quod si scissem illa hic maneret potiu', tū hīnc isses
foras.
at uidē quam inmerito aegritudo haec oritur mi abs te,
Sostrata:
rus habitatum abii concedens uobis et rei seruiens,
sumptus uostros otiumque ut nostra res posset pati, 225
mēo labori haud parcens praeter aequom atque
aetatem meam.

non te pro his curasse rebu' nequid aegre esset mihi!
 SO. non mea opera neque pol culpa euenit. LA. immo
 maxume:

sola hic fuisti: in tē ōmnis haeret culpa sola, Sostrata.
 quae hic erant curares, quom ego uos curis solui
 ceteris. 230

cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet?
 illi(u)s dices culpa factum? SO. haud equidem dico, mi
 Lache.

LA. gaudeo, ita me dī ament, gnati causa; nam de te
 quidem

sati' scio peccando detrimenti nil fieri potest.

SO. qui scis an ea causa, mi uir, me odisse
 adsimulauerit 235

ut cum matre plus una esset? LA. quid ais? non signi
 hoc sat est,

quod heri nemo uoluit uisentem ad eam te intro
 admittere?

SO. enī lassam oppido tum esse aībant: eo ad eam
 non admissa sum.

LA. tūōs esse ego illi mores morbum mage quam ullam
 aliam rem arbitror,

et merito adeo; nam uostrarum nullast quin gnatum
 uelit 240

ducere uxorem; et quae uobis placitast condicio
 datur:

ubi duxere impulsu uostro, uostro impulsu eāsdem
 exigunt.

II.ii: PHIDIPPVS LACHES SOSTRATA

ia⁷ PH. Etsi scio ego, Philumenā, mēum ius esse ut te
 cogam

quae ego imperem facere, ego tamen patrio animo
 uictu' faciam

ut tibi concedam neque tuae lubidini aduorsabor. 245

LA. atque eccum Phidippum optume uideo: hinc iam
 scibo hoc quid sit.

Phidippe, etsi ego mēis me omnibus scio ēsse adprime
 obsequentem,

sed non adeo ut mea facilitas corrumpat illorum
 animos:

quod tu si idem faceres, magis in rēm ēt uostram et
nostram id esset.

nunc uideo in illarum potestate esse te. PH. heia uero. 250

LA. adii te heri de filia: ut ueni, itidem incertum amisti.
haud ita decet, si perpetuam hanc uis esse adfinitatem,
celare te iras. siquid est peccatum a nobis profer:
aut ea refellendo aut purgando uobis corrigemus
te iudice ipso. sin east causa retinendi apud uos 255
quia aegrast, te mihi īniuriam facere arbitror, Phidippe,
si metui' satis ut meaē domi curetur diligenter.

at ita me dī ament, haud tibi hoc concedo – [etsi] illi
pater es –

ut tū illam saluam mage uelis quam ego: id adeo gnati
causa,

quem ego intellexi illam haud minus quam se ipsum
magni facere 260

neque adeo clam me est quā ēsse eum grauiter
laturum credam,

hoc si rescierit: ēo domum studeo haec priu' quam ille
redeat.

PH. Laches, et diligentiam uostram et benignitatem
noui et quae dicis omnia esse ut dicis animum induco,
et te hoc mihi cupio credere: illam ad uos redire studeo 265
si facere possim ullo modo. LA. quae res te id facere
prohibet?

eho num quid nam accusat uirum? PH. minime. nam
postquam attendi

magis et ui coepi cogere ut rediret, sancte adiurat
non posse apud uos Pamphilo se absente perdurare.
aliud fortasse aliis uiti est. ego sum animo leni natus: 270
non possum aduorsari meis. LA. em Sostrata. SO. heu
me miseram!

LA. certumne est istuc? PH. nunc quidem ut uidetur:
sed num quid uis?

nam est quod me transire ad forum iam oportet. LA.
eō tecum una.

II.iii:

SOSTRATA

*tr*⁷ Edepol ne nos sumus inique aequae omnes inuisae uiris
propter paucas, quae omnes faciunt dignae ut
uideamur malo. 275

nam ita me dĩ ament, quod me accusat nunc uir, sum
 extra noxiam.
 sed non facile est expurgatu: ita animum induxerunt
 socrus
 omnis esse iniquas. haud pol mequidem; nam
 numquam secus
 habui illam ac si ex mẽ ěsset gnata, nec quĩ hõc mi
 eueniat scio;
 nisi pol filium multimodis iam exspecto ut redeat
 domum.

280

III.i: PAMPHILVS PARMENO (MYRRINA)

*tr*⁸ PAM. Nemini plura acerba credo esse ex amore
 homini umquam oblata
*tr*⁷ quam mi. heu me infelicem, hancin ego uitam parsi
 perdere!
 hacin causa ego eram tanto opere cupidu' redeundi
 domum! hui
*tr*⁸ quanto fuerat praestabilius ubiuis gentium agere
 aetatem
*tr*⁷ quam huc redire atque haec ita esse miserum me
 resciscere!
 nam nos omnes quibus est alicunde aliquis obiectus
 labos,
 omne quod ěst interea tempu' priu' quam id
 rescitumst lucrost.
 PAR. ac sic citiu' qui te expedias his aerumnis reperias:
*tr*⁸ si non rediisses, haec irae factae essent multo
 ampliores.
 sed nunc aduentum tuom ambas, Pamphile, sciõ
 reuerituras:
 rem cognosces, iram expedies, rursum in gratiam
 restitues.
*tr*⁷ leuia sunt quae tu pergrauia esse in animum induxti
 tuom.
*ia*⁸ PAM. quid consolare me? an quisquam usquam
 gentiumst aequè miser?
 priu' quam hanc uxorem duxi habebam alibi animum
 amoris deditum;
 tamen numquam ausu' sum recusare eãm quam mi
 obtrudit pater:

285

290

295

iam in hac re, ut taceam, quouiis facile scitust quam
fuerim miser.

uix me illi <m> abstraxi atque inpeditum in ea
expediui animum meum,

uixque huc contuleram: em noua res ortast porro ab
hac quae me abstrahat.

tum matrem ex eâ re me aut uxorem in culpa
inuenturum arbitror;

quod quom ita esse inuenero, quid restat nisi porro ut
fiam miser? 300

nam matri' ferre iniurias me, Parmeno, pietas iubet;
tum uxori obnoxius sum: ita olim sũo me ingenio
pertulit,

tot mēas iniurias quae numquam in ullo patefecit
loco.

sed magnum nescioquid necessest euenisse, Parmeno,
unde ira inter eas intercessit quae tam permansit diu. 305

PAR. haud quidem hērcle; paruom. si uis uero ueram
rationem exsequi,

non maxumas quae maxumae sunt interdum irae
iniurias

faciunt; nam saepe est quibus in rebus aliu' ne iratus
quidem est,

quom de eâdem causast iracundu' factus inimicissimus.

pueri inter sese quam pro leuibu' noxiis iras gerunt! 310

quapropter? quia enĩm qui cōs gubernat animus eum
ĩfirmum gerunt.

itidem illae mulieres sunt ferme ut pueri leuĩ sententia:

*ia*⁷ fortasse unum aliquod uerbum inter eas iram hanc
conciuisse.

*ia*⁸ PAM. abĩ, Parmeno, intro ac me uenisse nuntia. PAR.
hem quid hōc est? PAM. tace.

trepidari sentio et cursari rursum prorsum. PAR.

agedum, ad fores

accedo propius. em sensistin? PAM. noli fabularier. 315

pro Iuppiter, clamorem audiui. PAR. tute loqueris, me
uetas.

(MY. *intus*) tace obsecro, mea gnata. PAM. matri' uox
uisast Philumenae.

nullus sum. PAR. quidum? PAM. perii. PAR. quā̃m ōb
rem? PAM. nescioquod magnum malum

profecto, Parmeno, me celant. PAR. uxorem

Philumenam

320

pauitare nescioquid dixerunt: id si forte est nescio.

PAM. interii! quor mihi id non dixti? PAR. quia non
poteram una omnia.

PAM. quid morbi est? PAR. nescio. PAM. quid?
nemon medicum adduxit? PAR. nescio.

PAM. cesso hinc ire intro ut hoc quam primum
quidquid est certo sciam?

*ia*⁷ quonam modo, Philumenā mea, nunc te offendam
adfectam?

325

nam si periculum ullum in te inest, perisse me una haud
dubiumst. –

*ia*⁶ PAR. non usu' factost mihi nunc hunc intro sequi,
nam inuisos omnis nos esse illis sentio:
herī nemo uoluit Sostratam intro admittere.

si forte morbus amplior factus siet

330

(quod sane nolim, maxume erī causa mei),

seruom ilico introisse dicent Sostratae,

aliquid tulisse comminiscentur mali

capiti atque aetati illorum morbu' qui auctu' sit:

era in crimen ueniet, ego uero in magnum malum.

335

III.ii: SOSTRATA PARMENO PAMPHILVS

*ia*⁷ SO. Nescioquid iamdudum audio hic tumultuari
misera:

male metuo ne Philumenaē mage morbus adgrauescat:
quod te, Aesculapi, et te, Salus, nequid sit huius oro.
nunc ad eam uisam. PAR. heus, Sostrata! SO. hēm?

PAR. iterum istinc excludere.

SO. ehēm, Parmeno, tun hic eras? perii, quid faciam
misera?

340

non uisam uxorem Pamphili, quom in proxumo hic sit
aegra?

PAR. non uisas? ne mittas quidem uisendi causa
quemquam.

nam quī amat quoī odio ipso est, bis facere stulte
duco:

laborem inanem ipso capīt et illi molestiam adfert.

tum filius tuos intro iit uidere, ut uenit, quid agat. 345
 SO. quid ais? an uenit Pamphilus? PAR. uenit. SO. dis
 gratiam habeo.

hēm! İstoc uerbo animu' mihi redit et cura ex corde
 excessit.

PAR. iam ea te causa maxume nunc hoc intro ire nolo;
 nam si remittent quippiam Philumenae dolores,
 omnem rem narrabit, scio, continuo sola soli 350
 quae İnter uos interuenerit, unde ortumst initium irae.
 atque eccum uideo ipsum egredi. quam tristist! SO. o
 mi gnate!

PAM. mea mater, salue. SO. gaudeo uenisse saluom.
 saluan

Philumenast? PAM. meliusculast. SO. utinam istuc ita
 di faxint!

quid tu igitur lacrimas? aut quid es tam tristi'? PAM.
 recte, mater. 355

SO. quid fuit tumulti? dic mihi: an dolor repente
 inuasit?

PAM. ita factumst. SO. quid morbi est? PAM. febris.

SO. cotidiana? PAM. ita aiunt.

i sodes intro. consequar iam te, mea mater. SO. fiat. –

PAM. tu pueris curre, Parmeno, obuam atque is onera
 adiuta.

PAR. quid? non sciunt ipsi uiam domum qua ueniant?

PAM. cessas? 360

III.iii:

PAMPHILVS

*tr*⁷ Nequeo mearum rerum initium ullum inuenire
 idoneum
 unde exordiar narrare quae necopinanti accidunt;
 partim quae perspexi hisce oculis, partim quae accepi
 auribus:

qua me propter exanimatum citius eduxi foras.
 nam modo intro me ut corripui timidus, alio suspicans 365
 morbo me uisurum adfectam ac sensi esse uxorem: ei
 mihi!

postquam me aspexere ancillae aduenisse, ilico omnes
 simul

laetae exclamant 'uenit', id quod me repente
 aspexerant.
 sed continuo uultum earum sensi inmutari omnium,
 quia tam incommode illic fors obtulerat aduentum
 meum. 370
 una illarum interea propere praecucurrit nuntians
 me uenisse. ego ei(u)s uidendi cupidu' recta consequor.
 postquam intro adueni, extemplo eiu' morbum
 cognoui miser,
 nam neque ut celari posset tempu' spatium ullum
 dabat
 neque uoce alia ac res monebat ipsa poterat conqueri. 375
 postquam aspexi, 'o facinus indignum' inquam et
 corripui ilico
 me inde lacrumans, incredibili rē atque atroci percitus.
 mater consequitur. iam ut limen exirem, ad genua
 accidit
 lacrumans misera. miseritumst. profecto hoc sic est, ut
 puto:
 omnibu' nobis ut res dant sese ita magni atque humiles 380
 sumus.
 hanc habere orationem mecum principio institit:
 'o mi Pamphile, abs te quā ob rem haec abierit
 causam uides,
 nam uitiumst oblatum uirgini olim a nescioquo
 improbo.
 nunc huc confugit tē atque alios partum ut celaret
 suom.'
 sed quom orata huius reminiscor nequeo quin 385
 lacrumem miser.
 'quaeque fors fortunast' inquit 'nobis quae te hodie
 obtulit,
 per eam te obsecramus ambae, si ius si fas est, uti
 aduorsa eiu' per te tecta tacitaque apud omnis sient.
 si umquam erga te animo esse amico sensisti eam, mi
 Pamphile,
 sine labore hanc gratiam te uti sibi des pro illa nunc 390
 rogat.
 ceterum de redducenda id facias quod in rem sit tuam.
 parturire eam nec grauidam esse ex te solus conscius,

nam aiunt tecum post duobu' concubuisse mensibus.
tum, postquam ad te uenit, mensis agitur hic iam
septimus:

quod te scire ipsa indicat res. nunc si potis est,

Pamphile,

395

maxume uolō doque operam ut clam partus eueniat
patrem

atque adeo omnis. sed si id fieri non potest quin
sentiant,

dicam abortum esse. sciō nemini aliter suspectum
fore

quin, quod ueri similest, ex te recte eum natum putent.
continuo exponetur. hic tibi nil est quicquam
incommodi,

400

et illi miserae indigne factam iniuriam contexeris.
pollicitus sum et seruare in eo certumst quod dixi
fidem.

nam de redducenda, id uero ne utiquam honestum
esse arbitror

nec faciam, etsi amor me grauiter consuetudoque
ei(u)s tenet.

lacrumo quae posthac futurast uita quom in mentem
uenit

405

solitudoque. o fortuna, ut numquam perpetuo's data!
sed iam prior amor me ad hanc rem exercitatum
reddidit,

quē ego tum consilio missum feci. idem [nunc] huc
operam dabo.

*ia*⁶ adēst Parmeno cum pueris. hunc minimest opus
in hac re adesse, nam olim soli credidi
ea me abstinuisse in principio quom datast.
uereor, si clamorem ei(u)s hic crebro exaudiat,
ne parturire intellegat. aliquo mihist
hinc ablegandu' dum parit Philumena.

410

III.iv: PARMENO SOSIA PAMPHILVS

*ia*⁶ PAR. Ain tu tibi hoc incommodum euenisse iter?
SO. non hercle uerbis, Parmeno, dici potest
tantum quam re ipsa nauigare incommodumst.
PAR. itan est? SO. o fortunate, nescis quid mali

415

praeterieris qui numquam es ingressus mare.
 nam alias ut mittam miserias, unam hanc uide: 420
 dies triginta aut plus eo in naui fui
 quom interea semper mortem exspectabam miser.
 ita usque aduorsa tempestate usi sumus.

PAR. odiosum. SO. haud clam me est. denique hercle
 aufugerim

potius quam redeam, si eō mihi redeundum sciam. 425

PAR. olim quidem te causae inpellebant leues,
 quod nunc minitare facere, ut faceres, Sosia.
 sed Pamphilum ipsum uideo stare ante ostium.
 ite intrō. ego hūnc adibo, siquid me uelit. –
 ere, etiam tu hic stas? PAM. et quidē tē exspecto.

PAR. quid est? 430

PAM. in arcem transcurso opus est. PAR. quō
 homini? PAM. tibi.

PAR. in arcem? quid eo? PAM. Callidemidem
 hospitem

Myconium, qui mecum una uectust, conueni.

PAR. perii. uouisse hunc dicam, si saluos domum
 redisset umquam, ut me ambulando rumperet? 435

PAM. quid cessas? PAR. quid uis dicam? an
 conueniam modo?

PAM. immō quod constitui me hodie conuenturum
 eum,

non posse, ne me frustra illi exspectet. uola.

PAR. at non noui homini' faciem. PAM. at faciam ut
 noueris:

magnu' rubicundu' crispu' crassu' caesius 440
 cadauerosa facie. PAR. dī illum perduint!

quid si non ueniet? maneamne usque ad uesperum?

PAM. maneto. curre. PAR. non queo: ita defessu'
 sum. –

PAM. ille abiit. quid agam infelix? prorsus nescio
 quo pacto hoc celem quod me orauit Myrrina, 445
 sūae gnatae partum. nam me miseret mulieris,
 quod potero faciam, tamen ut pietatem colam;
 nam me parenti potiu' quā amorī obsequi
 oportet. attat eccum Phidippum et patrem
 uideo. horsum pergunt. quid dicam hisce incertu' sum. 450

III.v:

LACHES

PHIDIPPVS

PAMPHILVS

^{tr7} LA. Dixitū dudum illam dixisse se exspectare filium?
 PH. factum. LA. uenisse aiunt: redeat. PA. causam
 quam dicam patri
 quā ōb rem non reducam nesciō. LA. quē ego hic
 audiui loqui?
 PA. certum offirmare est uiam me quam decreui
 persequi.
 LA. ipse est de quo hoc agebam tecum. PA. salue, mi
 pater. 455
 LA. gnate mi, salue. PH. bene factum te aduenisse,
 Pamphile;
 atque adeo, id quod maxumumst, saluom atque
 ualidum. PA. creditur.
 LA. aduenis modo? PA. admodum. LA. cedo, quid
 reliquit Phania
 consobrinu' noster? PA. sane hercle homō uoluptati
 obsequens
 fuit dum uixit; et qui sic sunt haud multum heredem
 iuuant, 460
 sibi uero hanc laudem relinquont 'uixit, dum uixit,
 bene.'
 LA. tum tu igitur nil attulisti plus una hac sententia?
 PA. quidquid est id quod reliquit, profuit. LA. immo
 obfuit,
 nam illum uiuom et saluom uellem. PH. inpune optare
 istuc licet:
 ill' reuiuēscet iam numquam. et tamen utrum malis
 scio. 465
 LA. heri Philumenam ad se accersi hic iussit. (dic
 iussisse te.)
 PH. noli fodere. iussi. LA. sed eam iam remittet. PH.
 scilicet.
 PA. omnem rem scio ut sit gesta. adueniens audiui
 modo.
 LA. at istos inuidos di perdant qui haec lubenter
 nuntiant!
 PA. ego me sciō cauisse ne ulla merito contumelia 470
 fieri a uobis posset; idque si nunc memorare hic uelim

quam fideli animo et benigno in illam et clementi fui,
uere possum, ni te ex ipsa haec mage uelim resciscere.
namque eo pacto maxume apud te meo erit ingenio
fides,

quom illa, quae nunc in me iniquast, aequa de me
dixerit.

475

neque mea culpa hoc discidium euenisse, id testor
deos.

sed quando sese esse indignam deputat matri meae
quae concedat cui(u)sque mores toleret sua modestia,
neque alio pacto componi potest inter eas gratia,
segreganda aut mater a me est, Phidippe, aut

Philumena.

480

nunc me pietas matri' potiu' commodum suadet sequi.

LA. Pamphile, haud inuito ad auris sermo mi accessit
tuos,

quom te postputasse omnis res prae parente intellego.
uerum uidē ne impulsus ira praeue insistas, Pamphile.

ia⁶

PA. quibus iris pulsu' nunc in illam iniquo' sim
quae numquam quicquam erga me commeritast, pater,
quod nollem, et saepe quod uellem meritam scio?

485

amoque et laudo et uehementer desidero,
nam fuisse erga me miro ingenio expertu' sum,
illique exopto ut relicuam uitam exigat

490

cum eo uiro me qui sit fortunator,
quandoquidem illam a me distrahit necessitas.

PH. tibi id in manust ne fiat. LA. si sanus sies,
iube illam redire. PA. non est consilium, pater:

matris seruibo commodis. LA. quod abis? mane!
mane, inquam! quod abis? – PH. quae haec est

495

pertinacia?

LA. dixin, Phidippe, hanc rem aegre laturum esse
eum?

quam ob rem te orabam filiam ut remittertes.

PH. non credidi edepol adeo inhumanum fore.

ita nunc is sibi me supplicaturum putat?

500

si est ut uelit reducere uxorem, licet;

sin alio animo, renumeret dotem huc, eat.

LA. ecce autem tu quoque proterue iracundus es!

PH. percontumax redisti huc nobis, Pamphile!

LA. decedet iam ira haec, etsi merito iratus est. 505
 PH. quia paullum uobis accessit pecuniae,
 sublatis animi sunt. LA. etiam mecum litigas?
 PH. deliberet renuntietque hodie mihi
 uelitne an non, ut alii, si huic non est, siet.
 LA. Phidippe, adēs, audi paucis. – abiit. quid mea? 510
 postremo inter se transigant ipsi ut lubet,
 quando nec gnatu' neque hīc mi quicquam
 obtemperant,
 quae dico parui pendunt. porto hoc iurgium
 ad ūxorem quoi(u)s haec fiunt consilio omnia,
 atque in eam hoc omne quod mihi aegrest euomam. 515

IV:i:

MYRRINA

PHIDIPPVS

*tr*⁸ MY. Perii! quid agam? quo me uortam? quid uiro mēo
 respondebo
 misera? nam audiuisse uocem pueri uisust uagientis:
*tr*⁷ ita corripuit derepente tacitu' sese ad filiam.
*tr*⁸ quod si rescierit peperisse eam, id qua causa clam me
 habuisse
tr. dim. cat. dicam non edepol scio. 520
*ia*⁸ sed ostium concrepuit. credo ipsum exire ad me. nulla
 sum!
*tr*⁷ PH. uxor ubi me ad filiam ire sensit, se duxit foras.
*ia*⁸ atque eccam! uideo. quid ais, Myrrina? heus, tibi dico.
 MY. mihine, uir?
*tr*⁸ PH. uir ego tuo' sim? tu uirum me aut hominem
 deputas adeo esse?
*tr*⁷ nam si utrumuis horum, mulier, umquam tibi uisus
 forem, 525
*tr*⁸ non sic ludibrio tuis factis habitus essem. MY. quibus?
 PH. at rogitas?
 peperit filia. hem! taces? ex qui? MY. istuc patrēm
 rogare est aequom?
*tr*⁷ (perii!) ex quo censes nisi ēx illo quoi datast nuptum
 obsecro?
*tr*⁸ PH. credo: neque adeo arbitrari patris est aliter. sed
 demiror
*tr*⁷ quid sit quam ob rem hunc tanto opere omnis nos
 celare uolueris 530

- partum, praesertim quom et recte et tempore suō
pepererit.
- tr*⁸ adeon peruicaci esse animo ut puerum praëdptares
perire,
ex quo firmiorem inter nos fore amicitiam posthac
scires,
potiu' quam aduorsum animi tui lubidinem esset cum
illo nupta!
- tr*⁷ ego etiam illorum esse hanc culpam credidi, quae test
penes. 535
- MY. misera sum. PH. utinam sciam ita esse istuc! sed
nunc mi in mentem uenit
de hac re quod locuta es olim, quom illum generum
cepimus:
nam negabas nuptam posse filiam tuam te pati
cū eo qui meretricem amaret, qui pernoctaret foris.
- MY. (quamuis causam hunc suspicari quam ipsam
ueram mauolo.) 540
- PH. multo priu' sciui quam tū illum habere amicam,
Myrrina;
uerum id uitium numquam decreui esse ego
adulescentiae,
nam id innatumst. at pol iam aderit se quoque etiam
quom oderit.
- ia*⁸ sed ut olim te ostendisti, eadem esse nil cessauisti
usque adhuc
ut filiam ab eo abduceres neu quod ego egissem esset
ratum. 545
- id nunc res indicium haec facit quo pacto factum
uolueris.
- tr*⁷ MY. adeon me esse peruicacem censes, quoi mater
siem,
ut eo essem animo, si ex usu esset nostro hoc
matrimonium?
- PH. tun prospicere aut iudicare nostram in rem quod
sit potes?
- audisti ex aliquo fortasse qui uidisse eum diceret
exeuntem aut intro euntem ad amicam. quid tum
postea? 550
- si modeste ac raro haec fecit, nonne ea dissimulare nos

magis humanumst quam dare operam id scire qui nos
oderit?

nam si is posset ab ea sese derepente auellere
quicum tot consuesset annos, non eum hominem
ducerem

555

nec uirum sati' firmum gnatae. MY. mitte
adulescentem, obsecro,

et quae me peccasse ais. abī, solum solus conueni,
rogā uelitne uxorem an non. sī est ut dicat uelle se,
redde; sin est autem ut nolit, recte ego consului meae.
PH. siquidem ille ipse non uolt et tu sensti in eo esse,

560

Myrrina,

peccatum, aderam quoi(u)s consilio fuerat ea par
prospici.

quam ob rem incendor ira esse ausam facere haec te
iniussu meo.

interdico ne extulisse extra aedis puerum usquam uelis.
(sed ego stultior mēis dictis parere hanc qui postulem.)

ibo intro atque edicam seruis ne quoquam ecferrī
sinant. —

565

*ia*⁸ MY. nullam pol credo mulierem me miseriorem
uiuere:

nām ut hic laturus hoc sit, si ipsam rem ut siet
resciuerit,

non edepol clam me est, quom hoc quod leuiust tām
animo irato tulit,

nec qua uia sententia eiu' possit mutari scio.

hoc mi unum ex plurumis miseriis relicuom fuerat
malum,

570

si puerum ut tollam cogit, quoi(u)s nos qui sit nescimus
pater.

nam quom compressast gnata, forma in tenebris nosci
non quitast,

neque detractum eī tum quicquamst qui posset post
nosci qui siet;

ipse eripuit uī, in digito quem habuit, uirgini abiens
anulum.

simūl uereor Pamphilum ne orata nostra nequeat
diutius

575

celare, quom sciet alienum puerum tolli pro suo.

IV.ii: SOSTRATA PAMPHILVS (LACHES)

*ia*⁸ SO. Non clam me est, gnate mi, tibi me esse
suspectam, uxorem tuam
propter mēos mores hinc abisse, etsi ea dissimulas
sedulo.
uerum ita me dī ament itaque optingant ex te quae
exoptem mihi ut
numquam sciens commerui merito ut caperet odium
illam mei. 580
teque ante quod me amare rebar, eī rei firmasti fidem,
nam mi intu' tuo' pater narrauit modo quo pacto me
habueris
praepositam amorī tūo. nunc tibi me certumst contra
gratiam
referre ut apud me praemium esse positum pietati
scias.
mi Pamphile, hoc et uobis et meaē commodum famae
arbitror: 585
ego rus abituram hinc cum tūo me esse certo decreui
patre,
ne mea praesentia obstet neu causa ulla restet relicua
quin tua Philumena ad te redeat. PA. quaeso, quid
īstuc consilist?
illius stultitia uicta ex urbe tu rus habitatum migres?
haud facies, neque sinam ut qui nobis, mater, male
dictum uelit, 590
meā pertinacia esse dicat factum, haud tuā modestia.
tum tūas amicas te et cognatas deserere et festos dies
meā causa nolo. SO. nil pol iām īstaec mihi res
uolūptatis ferunt:
dum aetati' tempu' tulit, perfuncta sati' sum. satias iam
tenet
studiorum istorum. haec mihi nunc curast maxuma ut
nequoi mea 595
longinquitas aetatis obstet mortemue expectet meam.
hic uideo me esse inuisam inmerito: tempust me
concedere.
sic optume, ut ego opinor, omnis causas praecidam
omnibus:

et mē hāc suspicione exsoluam et illis morem gessero.
sine me, obsecro, hoc effugere uolgu' quod male audit
mulierum.

600

PA. quam fortunatu' ceteris sum rebus, absque una
hac foret,
hanc matrem habens talem, illam autem uxorem! SO.
obsecro, mi Pamphile,
non tute incommodam rem, ut quaeque est, in
animum induces pati?

si cetera ita sunt ut uis itaque uti esse ego illa existumo,
mi gnate, da ueniam hanc mihi, redduc illam. PA. uae
misero mihi!

605

SO. et mihi quidem, nam haec res non minu' me male
habet quam te, gnate mi.

IV.iii:

LACHES

SOSTRATA

PAMPHILVS

*ia*⁷ LA. Quem cūm istoc sermonem habueris procul hinc
stans accepi, uxor.

*ia*⁸ istuc est sapere, qui ubiquomque opu' sit animum
possis flectere,

*tr*⁷ quod sit faciundum fortasse post, idem hōc nunc si
feceris.

SO. fors fuat pol. LA. abī rus ergo hinc: ibi ego tē ēt tu
me feres.

610

SO. spero ecastor. LA. ī ērgo intro et compone quae
tecum simul

*ia*⁶ ferantur. dixi. SO. ita ut iubes faciam. – PA. pater!

*tr*⁸ LA. quid uis, Pamphile? PA. hinc abire matrem?
minume. LA. quid ita istuc uis?

*tr*⁷ PA. quia de uxore incertu' sum etiam quid sim
facturus. LA. quid est?

*tr*⁸ quid uis facere nisi redducere? PA. (equidem cupio et
uix contineor,

615

*tr*⁷ sed non minuam mēum consilium: ex usu quod ēst id
persequar.)

credo ēa gratia concordēs, si non redducam, fore.

LA. nescias: uerum id tuā refert nil utrum illaec
fecerint

quando haec aberit. odiosa haec est aetas
adulescentulis.

	e medio aequom excedere est. postremo nos iam fabulae	620
<i>ia. dim</i>	sumu', Pamphile, 'senēx atque anus'.	
<i>ia⁷</i>	sed uideo Phidippum egredi per tempus. accedamus.	
IV.iv:	PHIDIPPVS LACHES PAMPHILVS	
<i>ia⁶</i>	PH. Tibi quoque edepol sum iratus, Philumena, grauiter quidē, nam hercle factumst abs te turpiter. etsi tibi causast de hac re: mater te inpulit.	625
	huic uero nullast. LA. opportune te mihi, Phidippe, in ipso tempore ostendis. PH. quid est?	
	PA. quid respondebo his? aut quo pacto hoc aperiam?	
	LA. dic filiae rus concessurum hinc Sostratam, ne reuereatur minu' iam quo redeat domum. PH. ah,	630
	nullam de his rebu' culpam commeruit tua: a Myrrina haec sunt mea ūxore exorta omnia. <PA.> mutatio fit! <PH.> ea nos perturbat, Lache.	
	PA. (dum ne reducam, turbent porro quam uelint.) PH. ego, Pamphile, esse inter nos, si fieri potest,	635
	adfinitatem hanc sane perpetuam uolo. sin est ut aliter tua siet sententia, accipias puerum. PA. (sensit peperisse: occidi!)	
	LA. puerum? quem puerum? PH. natus est nobis nepos.	
	nam abducta a uobis praegnas fuerat filia,	640
	neque fuisse praegnatem umquam ante hunc sciui diem.	
	LA. bene, ita me dĩ ament, nuntias, et gaudeo natum, tibi illam saluam. sed quid mulieris uxorem habes aut quibu' moratam moribus?	
	nosne hoc celatos tam diu! nequeo satis quā hōc mihi uidetur factum praue proloqui.	645
	PH. non tibi illud factum minu' placet quam mihi, Lache.	
	PA. etiamsi dudum fuerat ambiguum hoc mihi, nunc non est quōm eam sequitur alienus puer.	
	LA. nulla tibi, Pamphile, hic iam consultatiost.	650
	PA. (perii.) LA. hunc uidere saepe optabamus diem quom ex te esset aliqui' qui te appellaret patrem. euenit: habeo gratiam dis. PA. (nullu' sum.)	

LA. redduc uxorem ac noli aduorsari mihi.

PA. pater, si ex mē illa liberos uellet sibi
aut sese mecum nuptam, sati' certo scio,
non clam me haberet quae celasse intellego.

nunc quōm ēius alienum esse animum a me sentiam
nec conuenturum inter nos posthac arbitror,
quān ōb rem redducam? LA. mater quod suasit sua
adulescens mulier fecit. mirandumne id siet?

censen te posse reperire ullam mulierem
quae careat culpa? an quia non delincunt uiri?
PH. uosmet uidete iam, Lache et tu Pamphile,
remissan opu' sit uobis reductan domum.

uxor quid faciat in manu non est mea:
neutra in re uobis difficultas a me erit.
sed quid faciemu' puero? LA. ridicule rogas:
quidquid futurumst, huic suōm reddas scilicet
ut alamu' nostrum. PA. quem ipse neglexit pater,
ego alam? LA. quid dixti? eho ān non alemu',
Pamphile?

prodemu' quaeso potiu'? quāē haēc amentias?
enīmuero prorsu' iam tacere non queo,
nam cogis ea quae nolo ut praesente hoc loquar.
ignarum censes tūarum lacrumarum esse me
aut quid sit id quod sollicitare ad hunc modum?
primum hanc ubi dixti causam, te propter tuam
matrem non posse habere hanc uxorem domi,
pollicitast ea se concessuram ex aedibus.
nunc postquam ademptam hanc quoque tibi causam
uides,

puer quia clam test natu', nactus alteram es.
erras tui animi si me esse ignarum putas.
aliquando tandem huc animum ut adiungas tuom,
quam longum spatium amandi amicam tibi dedi!
sumptus quos fecisti in eam quam animo aequo tuli!

egi atque oraui tecum uxorem ut duceres.
tempus dixi esse. impulsu duxisti meo:
quae tum obsecutu' mihi fecisti ut decuerat.
nunc animum rursum ad meretricem induxti tuom,
quoi tu obsecutu' facis huic adeo iniuriam.
nam in eandem uitam te reuolutum denuo

uideo esse. PA. mene? LA. te ipsum. et facis iniuriam:
 confingi' falsas causas ad discordiam,
 ut cum illa uiuas, testem hanc quom abs te amoueris.
 sensitque adeo uxor, nam ei causa alia quae fuit 695
 quam ob rem abs te abiret? PH. plane hic diuinat:
 nam id est.

PA. dabō iusiurandum nil esse istorum mihi. LA. ah,
 redduc uxorem aut quā ōb rem non opu' sit cedo.

PA. non est nunc tempu'. LA. puerum accipias, nam is
 quidem

in culpa non est. post de matre uidero. 700

PA. omnibu' modis miser sum nec quid agam scio:

tot nunc me rebu' miserum concludit pater.

abibo hinc, praesens quando promoueo parum.

nam puerum iniussu, credo, non tollent meo,

praesertim in ea re quom sit mi adiutrix socrus. 705

LA. fugis? hem, nec quicquam certi respondes mihi? –
 num tibi uidetur esse apud sese? sine:

puerum, Phidippe, mihi cedo. ego alam. PH. maxume.

non mirum fecit uxor si hoc aegre tulit:

amarae mulieres sunt, non facile haec ferunt. 710

propterea haec irast, nam ipsa narrauit mihi.

id ego hoc praesente tibi nolueram dicere,

neque illi credebam primo. nunc uerum palamst,

nam omnino abhorrere animum huic uideo a

nuptiis.

LA. quid ergo agam, Phidippe? quid das consili? 715

PH. quid agas? meretricem hanc primum adeundam
 censeo.

oremus accusemu' grauiu' denique

minitemur si cū illo habuerit rem postea.

LA. faciam ut mones. eho puer <e>, curre ad

Bacchidem hanc

uicinam nostram: huc euoca uerbis meis. 720

et te oro porro in hac re adiutor sis mihi. PH. ah,

iamdudum dixi idemque nunc dico, Lache:

manere adfinitatem hanc inter nos uolo,

si ullo modo est ut possit, quod spero fore.

sed uin adesse me una dū istam conuenis? 725

LA. immō uero abi, aliquam puero nutricem para.

Vi:

BACCHIS

LACHES

*ia*⁸ BA. Non hoc de nihilost quod Laches me nunc
conuentam esse expetit,
nec pol me multum fallit quin quod suspicor sit quod
uelit.

LA. uidendumst ne minu' propter iram hinc impetrem
quam possiem,
aut nequid faciam plus quod post me minu' fecisse
satiu' sit.

730

ia. dim. cat. adgrediar. Bacchi', salue.

*ia*⁷ BA. salue, Lache. LA. credo edepol te non nil mirari,
Bacchis,

quid sit quapropter te huc foras puerum euocare iussi.

BA. ego pol quoque etiam timida sum quom uenit mi
in mentem quae sim,

ne nomen mihi quaesti obsiet; nam mores facile
tutor.

735

LA. si uera dici' nil tibist a me pericli, mulier,
nam iam aetate eā sum ut non siet peccato mi ignosci
aequom:

quo magis omnis res cautius ne temere faciam adcurō.
nam si id facis facturaue es bonas quod par est facere,
inscitum offerre iniuriam tibi inmerenti iniquom est.

740

BA. est magna ecastor gratiā dē istac re quam tibi
habeam,

nam qui post factam iniuriam se expurget parūm mi
prosit.

*tr*⁷ sed quid istuc est? LA. mēum receptas filium ad te
Pamphilum. BA. ah!

*ia*⁸ LA. sine dicam: uxorem hanc priu' quam duxit,
uostum amorem pertuli.

*tr*⁷ manē. nondum etiam dixi id quod uoluī. hic nunc
uxorem habet.

745

*tr*⁸ quaere alium tibi firmiorem dum tibi tempu'
consulendi est,

nam neque ille hoc animo erit aetatem neque pol tu
eadem istac aetate.

*tr*⁷ BA. quis id ait? LA. socrus. BA. men? LA. te ipsam. et
filiam abduxit suam,

puerumque ob eam rem clam uoluit, natu' qui est,
exstinguere.

*ia*⁸ BA. aliud si scirem qui firmare meam apud uos
possem fidem

750

*tr*⁷ sanctius quam iusiurandum, id pollicerer tibi, Lache,
*ia*⁸ me segregatum habuisse, uxorem ut duxit, a me
Pamphilum.

LA. lepida es. sed scin quid uolō potius sodes facias?

BA. quid uis? cedo.

LA. eas ad mulieres huc intro atque istuc iusiurandum
idem

*tr*⁷ polliceari illis. exple animum is teque hoc crimine
expedi.

755

BA. faciam quod pol, si esset alia ex hoc quaestu, haud
faceret, scio,

ut de tali causa nuptae mulieri se ostenderet.

sed nolo esse falsa fama gnatum suspectum tuom,
nec leuiorem uobis, quibus est minime aequom, eum
uiderier

inmerito, nam meritu' de me est quod queam illi ut
commodem.

760

LA. facilem beniuolumque lingua tua iam tibi me
reddidit,

nam non sunt solae arbitratae haec. ego quoque etiam
credidi.

nunc quam ego te esse praeter nostram opinionem
comperi,

fac eadem ut sis porro: nostra utere amicitia ut uoles.
aliter si facies – reprimam me ne aegre quicquam ex
me audias.

765

uerum hoc moneo unum, qualis sim amicus aut quid
possiem
potiu' quam inimicus, periculum facias.

V.ii:

PHIDIPPVS

LACHES

BACCHIS

PH. Nil apud me tibi

*tr*⁸ defieri patiar, quin quod opu' sit benigne praebeatur.
*ia*⁷ sed quom tu satura atque ebria eri', puer ut satur sit
facito.

LA. noster socer, uideo, uenit: puero nutricem adducit.

770

Phidippe, Bacchis deierat persancte . . . PH. haecin east? LA. haec est.

PH. nec pol istae metuont deōs neque eas respicere deōs opinor.

BA. ancillas dedo: quolubet cruciatu per me exquire. haec res hic agitur: Pamphilo me facere ut redeat uxor oportet. quod si perficio non paenitet me famae, solam fecisse id quod aliae meretrices facere fugitant.

775

LA. Phidippe, nostras mulieres suspectas fuisse falso nobis in re ipsa inuenimus: porro hanc nunc experiamur.

nam si compererit crimini tua se uxor credidisse, missam iram faciet. sin autem est ob eam rem iratu' gnatus

780

quod peperit uxor clam, id leuest. cito ab eo haec ira abscedet.

profecto in hac re nil malist quod sit discidio dignum.

PH. uelim quidem hercle. LA. exquire: adest. quod sati' sit faciet ipsa.

PH. quid mihi istaec narras? an quia non tute ipse dudum audisti

de hac re animu' meus ut sit, Laches? illis modo explete animum. —

785

LA. quaeso edepol, Bacchi', quod mihi es pollicita tute ut serues.

BA. ob eam rem uin ego introeam? LA. ī, atque exple animum is, coge ut credant.

BA. eo, etsi sciō pol is forē mēum conspectum inuisum hodie,

nam nupta meretrici hostis est, a uiro ubi segregatast.

LA. at haec amicae erunt, ubi quam ob rem adueneris resciscent,

790

[PH. at easdem amicas fore tibi promitto rem ubi cognorint]

nam illas errore et te simul suspicione exsolues.

BA. perii, pudet Philuminae. me sequimini huc intro ambae. —

LA. quid ęst quod mihi malim quam quod huic
intellego euenire,
ut gratiam ineat sine suo dispendio et mihi prosit? 795
nam si est ut haec nunc Pamphilum uere ab se
segregarit,
scit sibi nobilitatem ex eo et rem natam et gloriam esse.
| *tr*⁸ | referet gratiam ei unaque nos sibi opera amicos iunget. | |

V.iii:

PARMENO

BACCHIS

*tr*⁷ PA. Edepol ne meam erus esse operam deputat parui
preti,
qui ob rem nullam misit frustra ubi totum desedi diem, 800
Myconium hospitem dum exspecto in arce
Callidemidem.
itaque ineptus hodie dūm illi sedeo, ut quisque uenerat,
accedebam: 'adulescens, dicdum quaeso mi, es tu
Myconius?'
'non sum.' 'at Callidemides?' 'non.' 'hospitem ecquem
Pamphilum
hic habes?' omnes negabant, neque eum quemquam
esse arbitror. 805
denique hercle iam pudebat: abii. sed quid Bacchidem
ab nostro adfine exeuntem uideo? quid huic hic est rei?
BA. Parmeno, opportune te offers. propere curre ad
Pamphilum.
PA. quid eo? BA. dic me orare ut ueniat. PA. ad te?
BA. immo, ad Philumenam.
PA. quid rei est? BA. tuā quod nil refert percontari
desinas. 810
PA. nil aliud dicam? BA. etiam: cognosse anulum illum
Myrrinam
gnatae suae fuisse quem ipse olim mi dederat. PA.
scio.
tantumne est? BA. tantum. aderit continuo hoc ubi ex
te audiuerit.
sed cessas? PA. minime equidem, nam hodie mihi
potestas haud datast.
ita cursando atque ambulando totum hunc contriui
diem. 815

- ia*⁷ Quantam obtuli aduentu meo laetitiam Pamphilo
 hodie!
 quot commodas res attuli! quot autem ademi curas!
 gnatum eî restituo, qui paene harunc ipsiusque opera
 periit;
 uxorem, quam numquam est ratus posthac se
 habiturum, reddo.
 qua re suspectu' sūo patri et Phidippo fuit, exsolui. 820
 hic adeo his rebus anulus fuit initium inueniundis.
 nam memini abhinc mensis decem fere ad me nocte
 prima
 confugere anhelantem domum sine comite, uini
 plenum,
 cūm hōc anulo: extimui ilico. 'mi Pamphile,' inquam
 'amabo,
 quid exanimatu's obsecro? aut unde anulum istum
 nactu's? 825
 dic mi.' ille alias res agere se simulare. postquam id
 uideo,
 nescioquid suspicariet mage coepi, instare ut dicat.
 homō se fatetur uī in uia nescioquam compressisse,
 dicitque sese illi anulum, dum luctat, detraxisse.
 eum haec cognouit Myrrinā in digito modo me
 habentem. 830
 rogat unde sit. narro omnia haec, inde est cognitio
 facta
 Philumenam compressam esse ab eo et filium inde
 hunc natum.
 haec tot propter me gaudia illi contigisse laetor,
 etsi hoc meretrices aliae nolunt neque enim est in rem
 nostram
 ut quisquam amator nuptiis laetetur. uerum ecastor 835
 numquam animum quaesti gratia ad malas adducam
 partis.
 ego dūm illo licitumst usa sum benigno et lepido et
 comi.
 incommode mihi nuptiis euenit, factum fateor:
 at pol me fecisse arbitror ne id merito mi eueniret.

multa ex quo fuerint commoda, eius incommoda
aequomst ferre.

840

Viv: PAMPHILVS PARMENO BACCHIS

*tr*⁸ PAM. Vidě, mi Parmeno, etiam sodes ut mi haec certa
et clara attuleris,

*tr*⁷ ne me in breue conicias tempu' gaudio hoc falso frui.

PAR. uisumst. PAM. certen? PAR. certe. PAM. deu'
sum si hoc ităst. PAR. uerum reperiēs.

PAM. manědum sodes: timeo ne aliud credam atque
aliud nunties.

PAR. maneo. PAM. sic te dixē opinor, inuenisse
Myrrinam

845

Bacchidem anulum suum habere. PAR. factum. PAM.
eum quem olim ei dedi:

*tr*⁸ eaque hoc te mihi nuntiare iussit. itanest factum? PAR.
ita, inquam.

*tr*⁷ PAM. quis me est fortunatior uenustati'que adeo
plenior?

egon prō hoc te nuntio qui donem? qui? qui? nescio.

tr. dim. cat. PAR. at ego sciō. PAM. quid? PAR. nihilo enim,

850

*tr*⁷ nam neque in nuntio neque in me ipso tibi boni quid
sit scio.

PAM. egon qui ab Orco mortuom me reducem in
lucem feceris

*ia*⁸ sinam sine munere a me abire? ah, nimium me
ignauom putas.

*ia*⁶ sed Bacchidem eccam uideo stare ante ostium.
mē exspectat, credo. adibo. BA. salue, Pamphile.

855

PAM. o Bacchis, o mea Bacchi', seruatrix mea!

BA. bene factum et uolup est. PAM. factis ut credam
facis,

antiquamque adeo tūam uenustatem obtines

*ia*⁸ ut uolūptati obitu' sermo aduentu' tuo', quoquamque
adueneris,

semper siet. BA. at tū ēcastor morem antiquom atque
ingenium obtines

860

ut unus hominum homo te uiuat numquam quisquam
blandior.

PAM. hahahae, tun mihi istuc? BA. recte amasti,
 Pamphile, uxorem tuam.
 nam numquam ante hunc diem meîs oculis eâm, quod
 nossem, uideram:

perliberali' uisast. PAM. dic uerum. BA. ita me dĩ
 ament, Pamphile.

PAM. dic mi, harum rerum numquid dixti iam patri?

BA. nil. PAM. neque opus est 865
 adeo muttito. placēt non fieri hoc itidem ut in
 comoediis
 omnia omnes ubi resciscunt. hic quos par fuerat
 resciscere
 sciunt; quos non autem aequomst scire neque
 resciscunt neque scient.

tr⁷ BA. immo etiam qui hoc occultari facilius credas dabo.
 Myrrina ita Phidippo dixit iureiurando meo 870
 se fidem habuisse et propterea te sibi purgatum. PAM.
 optumest,
 speroque hanc rem esse euenturam nobis ex
 sententia. —

PAR. ere, licetne scire ex te hodie, quid sit quod feci
 boni?

aut quid istuc est quod uos agiti'? PAM. non licet.

PAR. tamēn suspicor:

ego hūnc ab Orco mortuom quo pacto . . . ! PAM.
 nescis, Parmeno, 875
 quantum hodie profueris mihi et ex quanta aerumna
 extraxeris.

PAR. immō uero scio, neque inprudens feci. PAM. ego
 istuc sati' scio. PAR. an

temere quicquam Parmeno praetereat quod facto usu'
 sit?

PAM. sequere me intro, Parmeno. PAR. sequor.

equidem plus hodie boni
 feci inprudens quam sciens ante hunc diem umquam.
 plaudite!

COMMENTARY

THE DIDASCALIAE

Each of T.'s plays was prefaced by a brief, formulaic set of production notes we call its 'didascalia'. (The didascalia for *An.* is missing from the MSS, but Don. preserves its contents.) The name recalls Aristotle's Διδασκαλία (from διδάσκαλοι 'producers'), a work of theatre-history based on the archons' official archive at Athens, and modern editors of T. follow the practice in the MSS that gives these texts the epigraphic look of official records. These Roman didascaliae, however, are neither official nor authoritative. Rome of the mid-Republic lacked a state archive, and what records magistrates kept would have remained their personal property after holding office. (The *commentarii aedilium* sometimes evoked in this context are a scholarly fiction.) The information in the Terentian didascaliae – both the tantalizingly suggestive and the maddeningly corrupt – probably derives, ultimately, from the acting company's own annotations, amalgamated and regularized by subsequent antiquarian research of the kind first associated with Varro and his teacher, Aelius Stilo, in the first century BCE (Goldberg 2005: 69–75).

The Bembinde codex (A) preserves a long didascalical note for *Hecyra*. A shorter, seemingly more corrupt version appears in the other MSS, while the introduction to the play by Don. contains similar information in narrative form. Reconciliation of their conflicting details is problematic (Klose 1966: 7–9).

DIDASCALIA I

acta 'produced', the technical term for staging a play (*OLD* 25).

ludis Megalensibus: the Megalenses, held on the Palatine hill, honoured Cybele, the Asian Magna Mater, whose arrival at Rome in 204 marked a turning point in the Second Punic War (Gruen 1990: 5–33). Pl.'s *Pseudolus* was staged at the dedication of her temple in 191. Four of T.'s six plays were staged at this April festival. See Introduction 2.

aedilibus curulibus: these magistrates presided over the *ludi Megalenses*. The aedileship conferred membership in the Senate but was not required for holding higher office. The responsibility for staging games, however, gave ambitious politicians an immediate opportunity to gain public recognition by the lavishness of their display, and it may be significant that these aediles, Sex. Julius Caesar and Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, who held office in 165, both went on to win the consulship, Dolabella in 159 and Caesar in 157.

modos 'music' (*OLD* 8b). The importance of music to Roman comedy is implicit in the care taken to record the contribution of the composer/musician Flaccus,

Claudius' slave. For the tibicen's role, see Moore 2008: 13–17 and 2012: 27–35, Marshall 2006: 234–44. Flaccus provided the music for all T.'s plays.

tibiis paribus 'on pipes of equal length'. The tibia (Gk. *aulos*) consisted of two double-reed pipes played simultaneously, though they could vary in length, i.e. *pares* or *impares*. The sound, probably closer to the modern oboe than the medieval shawm, was the regular accompaniment not just for theatrical performances, but for banquets, processions, and rituals of many kinds. See Moore 2012: 35–63.

tota 'throughout' (*OLD* 3a), i.e. with no change in instrumentation. *fabula* is understood.

Menandru: i.e. Μενάνδρου. The first clear error in the record: T.'s Greek model was in fact the *Hekyra* of Apollodorus of Carystus, as Don. Praef. unequivocally states.

facta est V 'written fifth', another error. The play is customarily placed fifth in the order of plays, but if first produced in 165, it was actually written second, just after *An.*, to which it bears striking similarities of theme (Penwill 2004: 131–2).

sine prologo: merely an inference from the fact that no prologue survives from that first performance. The introduction created for that occasion was more likely lost in the course of transmission.

secundo: the adv. is commonly omitted by editors since it appears nonsensical. Cn. Octavius and T. Manilius Torquatus were consuls in 165, the year of the first production, while the second performance was in 160 at the funeral games of Aemilius Paullus. Why the consuls receive mention here is unexplained: their presence would be more easily accounted for in the second version below, which mentions the *ludi Romani*, since a consul officiated whenever possible at the races on that occasion. Cf. En. *An.* 79–80 Sk. *consul quom mittere signum uolt*. An alternative intervention would be to remove the consuls and read *secundo* with *relata est*.

Lucio Aemilio Paulo: dat. Cf. Liv. 23.30.15 *M. Aemilio Lepido . . . filii tres Lucius, Marcus, Quintus, ludos funebres . . . dederunt*.

non est placita: *placeo* in both active and deponent perf. appears in the prologues as almost a technical term for a play's success (or failure) before an audience.

Fulvio . . . Marcio: aediles in 160. Fulvius was the younger son of Ennius' patron, M. Fulvius Nobilior, the victor at Ambracia. Both aediles again reached the consulship, Fulvius in 153 and Marcus in 149. The only suitable occasion remaining for a performance in 160 would have been the *ludi Romani*.

Luc . . . Turpio: this appears to be an amalgamation of two names. L. Ambivius Turpio is well known as T.'s producer and widely thought to be the speaker of his prologues (Brown 2002: 229–35). L. Sergius (Turpio?) is unknown, perhaps a partner, but just as likely the producer of a revival production at a later time.

DIDASCALIA II

Iudis Romanis: the great September festival in honour of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Most famous for its chariot races, it was the first festival at Rome to acquire a formal theatrical component when the Senate commissioned Livius Andronicus to produce a tragedy and a comedy in Latin for the games of 240 (Introduction 1). If the first didascalia is correct, this must be an error, perhaps confusing the first performance and the third.

Octauio . . . Manlio: the consular date, if appropriate at all, supports the first notice of 165, i.e. five years before Paullus' funeral.

Martio: clearly an error for Marcius, as above. So the Calliopian MSS all read Minutius for Minucius in the didascalia to *Ad*.

THE PROLOGUES

All T.'s plays begin not with a narrative prologue of the kind found in Menander and in Plautine plays like *Amphitruo* and *Menaechmi*, an expository device often counted among Euripides' gifts to the comic tradition, but with polemical speeches that immerse his audiences in a literary debate over the poet's artistic agenda and its reception (Slater 1992). Precedent for this type of public quarrel may lie in the parabasis of Aristophanic comedy (Arnott 1985), but whether T. himself first thought to write prologues this way or built upon something he found in his fourth-century Greek models remains unknown. The historicity of the struggle he describes is equally unclear. Images of the sensitive young poet and the stalwart producer, who champions his cause against the opposition of boorish crowds and jealous colleagues, are so affectingly drawn that they were long accepted at face value (e.g. Duckworth 1952: 61–5, Mattingly 1959), but attention to the rhetorical qualities of these speeches now encourages greater scepticism about their content (Gelhaus 1972, Goldberg 1986: 31–60). Their arguments are increasingly recognized to be at best tendentious, and even as basic a 'fact' of the Terentian biography as the *Hecyra*'s early stage failures has been ascribed either to authorial fiction (Gruen 1992: 210–18, Sharrock 2009: 246–9) or scholarly misunderstanding (Parker 1996: 592–601). Nor do these speeches entirely abandon the ancient prologue's traditional functions: their aesthetic arguments are calculated to flatter audiences while engaging them in the business on the stage, the basic goal of any *captatio benevolentiae*, and the struggle as depicted in each prologue is tailored to establish at least a thematic relationship to the specific situation in

the play being introduced (Lada-Richards 2004, Gowers 2004, Sharrock 2009: 68–75).

Yet even by Terentian standards, the case of *Hecyra* is unusual. The didascaliae record three separate attempts to perform this play, an aborted production at the *ludi Megalenses* of 165 and another at the funeral of Aemilius Paullus in 160, followed by a successful performance later in 160, presumably at the *ludi Romani* (Introduction 3.1). The MSS in turn preserve two prologues. Since the first of these, shorter and possibly abridged, mentions an aborted production, it is identified as the prologue used for the revival at Paullus' funeral. The second prologue, which describes two successive failures, is thus presumed to have introduced the third, successful production in 160. In both cases, the speaker is T.'s producer, Ambivius Turpio (Brown 2002: 229–35). No prologue remains from the original performance, though there may well have been one.

Echoes, repetitions, and incongruities raise questions about the relationship between the surviving prologues. The artfully concise Prologue I (Goldberg 1986: 37–40) reads like an introduction to the more expansive arguments of Prologue II, which is itself carefully constructed, devoting twenty lines to establishing the speaker's own *auctoritas* and twenty more to the difficulties in producing *Hecyra* before ending with an eight-line recapitulation, which forms an elegant and syntactically complex *captatio*. Its style is richly rhetorical, playing deftly with sound, rhythm, and meaning while alternately lecturing, cajoling, and flattering its audience. The story it tells, however, is internally inconsistent: was it the expectation of boxers or a tightrope walker that interrupted the original production (33–4)? Was the audience on that occasion distracted by those activities or disrupted by a second crowd coming to see them (35–6)? How could the poet, with four hits already to his credit, including the spectacular *Eunuchus*, still claim to be in his producer's *tutela* (52–3)? Here, as elsewhere in the prologues, the pose of struggling neophyte seems ill-matched to the occasion. As Gowers astutely, if euphemistically observes, 'Terence's literary career as projected through the sequence of plays does not follow any consistent trajectory' (2004: 163). Whether the inconsistency springs from factual errors in the record, from the exigencies of each individual occasion, or from the intervention of a later, amalgamating editor is beyond our knowledge.

The metre is, as for all spoken verse in Roman drama, the iambic senarius.

PROLOGUE I

1 *Hecyra* 'The Mother-in-law' (Ἑκυρά). T. leaves Apollodorus' title untranslated, his common practice (*Hauton timorumenos*, *Adelphoe*). Since Naevius, two generations earlier, often did the same (e.g. *Colax*, *Gymnasticus*, *Technicus*), the practice suggests not growing Hellenization at Rome but the Romans' general familiarity with Greek domestic vocabulary (Wright 1974: 89–92, Jocelyn 1969:

58–61). **fabulae:** hiatus, rare in T., creates a significant pause (e.g. 429, 745). An audience without a printed programme requires a clear announcement of the coming entertainment, which the prologue takes care to provide. **datast** ‘offered’. Don. distinguishes between a play presented (*dare*) and a play that is successful (*stare*), a distinction probably inferred from T.’s own usage at *Hau.* 15, *Ph.* 9, 10.

2 nouā, nouom: the same word used in different senses, i.e. ‘for the first time’ (*OLD* 1) and ‘unforeseen’ (*OLD* 4), is a form of wordplay (*paronomasia*) well known to Roman rhetoric. Verbal tricks of many kinds, including repetition, alliteration, elaborate parallelisms and striking juxtapositions, are especially frequent in the prologues. Enjambment of the first line puts the colon-boundary after *noua*, allowing its naturally light final syllable to be treated as heavy in the manner characteristic of verse ends (*brevis in longo*). **uitium** ‘fault’, a term with connotations of augury (Don.), i.e. a fault due to external circumstances rather than to any inherent imperfection.

3 neque spectari neque cognosci ‘neither seen nor appreciated’, i.e. the play failed to get a sympathetic hearing. The two verbs balance the two preceding nouns. So unequivocal a statement makes it hard to doubt that *something* went wrong at this performance, though the explanation here and at 33–6 may well be tendentious. Commentators often follow Don. in taking the recollection at *Ph.* 32 of an earlier time *quom per tumultum noster grex motus locost* as a reference to this occasion. Additional echoes are adduced by Mattingly 1959: 150–3. See Introduction 3.1 for *Hec.*’s vexed (and vexing) stage history.

4 ita ‘to such an extent’ (*OLD* 14). **populus:** a pejorative sense is often heard here, i.e. ‘the groundlings’, but at *An.* 3 *populo ut placerent quas fecisset fabulas*, the word means simply ‘the public’. **studio stupidus** ‘struck dumb with desire’. The adj. is limited in connotation, *pro stupens* (Don.): cf. Pl. *Epid.* 583 (to the unquestionably shrewd Acropolistis) *quid stas stupida? quid taces?* ‘Why do you stand dumbstruck? Why are you silent?’ **in funambulo:** tightrope artists were sufficiently popular at Rome to make ‘walking a tightrope’ proverbial (*per extantum funem . . . ire*, Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.210), and their skill becomes a point of wonder (e.g. Juv. 14.272–2, with Mayor 1900 ad loc.). So too August. *Ep.* 120.5 (with a possible Terentian echo) *nam et in theatris homines funambulū mirantur, musicis delectantur: in illo stupet difficultas; in his retinet pascitque iucunditas*, ‘In the theatres men marvel at the tightrope walker, delight in the musicians; in the former case, the difficulty astounds them, pleasure holds and gratifies them in the latter.’ The two iambs of *funambulo* suggest an emphatic end to the line, but enjambment completes the thought only with what follows.

5 occuparat: syncopated plupf. There is no indication (*pace* Parker 1996: 594–5) that the *populus* in question was a different crowd from the audience gathered to watch the play. The improvised performance space at the Megalensia would

have made it especially easy for audiences to be distracted by other activities in the vicinity (Introduction 3.1). **nunc**, i.e. five years later at Paullus' funeral games. In the interval, Turpio successfully produced *Hau.* and *Eu.* at the *ludi Megalenses* (163 and 161 respectively) and *Ph.* at the *ludi Romani* of 161. **pro noua**: the play is 'nearly new' either because it was never fully performed or because it has been revised. Or both. The prologue is characteristically vague.

6 is qui scripsit: all the prologues refer to the dramatist in the third person, and never by name. The speaker makes the play's cause his own. **hanc**: sc. *fabulam*, obj. of *referre*.

7 referre 'revive' (*OLD* 16), a recurrent refrain in these two prologues (29, 38). **uendere**: Roman theatre was a thoroughly commercial enterprise. Playwrights wrote for professional companies that sold their services to the aediles or, in the case of funeral games, the family of the deceased (Introduction 1.1). The wry humour here may respond to an accusation of double-dipping: the ritual error (*uitium et calamitas*) alluded to would itself suggest a legitimate rationale for reproduction.

PROLOGUE II

9 Orator 'advocate' (*OLD* 2). The legal connotation suits the forensic pose of the following speech. Cf. *Hau.* 11 *oratorem esse uoluit me, non prologum* and *Pl. Am.* 33–6, playing on Mercurius as *iustus orator*. Don. nevertheless prefers the sense 'ambassador', noting that diplomats were sacrosanct, and quotes *Pl. Poen.* 384 *impias, ere, te: oratorem uerberas*. 'You're polluting yourself, master: you're beating a diplomat.'

ornatu prologi: several Plautine prologues, e.g. *Capt.*, *Cas.*, *Men.*, *Poen.*, are spoken by extra-dramatic figures, neither divinities like Arcturus of *Rud.* nor characters like Charinus of *Mer.* They may have worn a distinct costume, or at least indicated their role by speaking without a mask (Beare 1964: 194–5). The claim here may thus be literally true, although the prologue-speaker has a recognizable identity as T.'s producer, and the *auctoritas* he commands in that role is integral to his appeal.

10 exorator (*exoro* + *-ator*) 'a successful orator', creating the equivalent of *exorem* while playing on *orator* just above. Cf. the wordplay *spe incerta certum laborem*, 17. The root sense of *oro* 'supplicate' (*OLD* 1) lies just below the surface here at the beginning of a play replete with supplication, e.g. 116, 338, 445, 498, 686, 809. **iure** 'privilege' (*OLD* 10), obj. of *uti*. **senem**: predicative.

12 nouas . . . exactas: sc. *fabulas*. The noun will often be understood and is never expressed in what follows. *exigo* is almost a technical term for stage failure here and 15, also at *An.* 27. (Don. glosses *expulsas*, sc. *e scaena*.) This obj. of *feci* then becomes the subj. of *inueterascerent* by the figure called prolepsis, a favourite stylistic device in T. See 280n. **inueterascerent**: grow old in the repertoire.

The result clause depends on *feci*. Ambivius claims he has been able to turn initial flops into enduring hits.

13 scriptura ‘writings’ (*OLD* 4b). **euanesceret**: the echoing verb forms create a desired effect. Cf. Pl. *Men.* 11–12 *hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen | non atticissat, uerum sicilicissat*. The iterative verbs imply that plays remained in the repertoire, important (if indirect) testimony for the fact that multiple productions and subsequent revivals were the norm. Pl. *Cas.* 8–22 provides the clearest, though not unique, example of this fact. See Duckworth 1952: 65–8, Goldberg 2004: 392–6.

14 Caecili: gen. sing. in *-ī*, from the contraction of **-iū* to *-ī* in the second declension, is the norm in Latin until the late Republic (Weiss 2009: 223). Caecilius Statius, ranked first among authors of *palliata* comedies by Volcarius Sedigitus (ap. Gell. 15.24, cf. Cic. *Opt. gen.* 1.2) and admired by Varro for his plot construction (ap. Non. 596L), was apparently T.’s great predecessor in Ambivius’ stable of poets. *Vita Ter.* 29–35 tells how T. succeeded in selling his first play to the aediles only by winning Caecilius’ approval, though a suspiciously similar story is told of the tragedians Accius and Pacuvius. Caecilius’ style was firmly in the *palliata* tradition, though his interest in character may have prefigured T. (Wright 1974: 87–126, Manuwald 2011: 234–42). Only T.’s prologues claim directly that he experienced any difficulty in winning acceptance, but there is a hint elsewhere that Caecilius, like T., defended himself against a charge of plagiarism in the treatment of Greek models (Goldberg 2005: 48–50). **didici**: the actor’s task, i.e. to learn (and thus play) a part. *doceo* is what producers and dramatists do, as Cic. *Brut.* 72 *Livius primus fabulam docuit*, *Tusc.* 4.63 *cum Orestem fabulam . . . doceret Euripides*. So Don. ad 56 *docet enim poeta, discit scaenicus*. **nouas**: emphatically placed, ‘when they were still unknown’.

15 partim . . . earum: as the old acc. of *pars* (Weiss 2009: 201), the adv. can be constructed with a part. gen. (*OLD* 1b). **steti**: the metaphor for success corresponding to *exigo* for failure. Cf. *Ph.* 9–10 (of a rival dramatist) *quom stetit olim noua, actoris opera magis stetisse quam sua*, ‘When a new play once succeeded, its success owed more to the actor’s work than to his own.’ As James Barrie observed of his own experience as a dramatist, some plays peter out while others pan out.

16 dubiam ‘uncertain’ (*OLD* 3c). Ambivius stresses that failure can owe more to chance than to any inherent fault in a play.

17 mihi: ethical dat. (*SEL* II. 146–8, *NLS* §66).

18 agere: the most common verb for producing (or acting in) a play (*OLD* 25); cf. Pl. *Bac.* 214–15 *etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam aequae ac me ipsum amo, | nullam aequae inuitus specto, si agit Pellio*, ‘Even *Epidicus*, a play I love as much as my own self – I watch no play more reluctantly, if Pellio is producing [or acting in] it.’ **ab eodem**, i.e. *a Caecilio*.

19 *studiose . . . ab studio*: another play on a stem with multiple meanings, here ‘earnestly’ and ‘occupation’. *studium* is also used of a dramatist’s career at *Hau.* 23 and *Ph.* 2, 18. An implicit contrast with the original audience’s *studium* at the *ludi* of 165 (4) may be intended. The caesura in the third foot shows that *studiose* is to be understood with *agere*. Prosodic hiatus, preferred to elision after a monosyllable, produces the scansion *nē illum*.

20 *perfecti* ‘I brought it about’ (*OLD* 6b). ***spectarentur . . . cognitae*:** the echo of 3, *neque spectari neque cognosci*, reads like an expansion of the earlier argument, raising the possibility that the first prologue was abridged to create a more effective reading version of what the complete text then included as a discrete prologue.

21 *placitae sunt*: as in the *didascaliae*, *placeo* either as active or deponent perf. describes the play’s success before an audience. ***in locum*** ‘to his position’ (*OLD* 18).

22 *aduorsarium*: gen. pl. Ambivius imputes to Caecilius the same kind of trouble with anonymous rivals that T. was said to have faced from the *uetus poeta* Don. identified as Luscius Lanuvinus (ad *An.* 1). The *iniuria* remains unspecified. Other prologues claim that T. was accused of everything from plagiarism to defective plot construction to weak writing (Slater 1992: 86–96), though the elaborate professional cabal against him reconstructed by Mattingly 1959 is no more credible than the political opposition adduced by Umbrico 2010: 79–85.

23 *arte musica*: narrowly, a reminder that music was essential to comedy’s appeal, working to define both its action (Marshall 2006: 203–34) and its individual characters (Moore 1999). For this literal sense, cf. *Eu.* 476–7, where accomplishments claimed *in litteris*, *in palaestra*, *in musicis* reflect the traditional tripartite structure of Greek education (Morgan 1998: 12–15). T.’s musicality was different from Pl.’s, but music in this narrow sense is no less important to a play’s effect. Though *Hec.* has two very long runs of *senarii* (1–97, 623–726), c. 56% of its 880 lines were performed to the *tibicen*’s accompaniment. Thus the prominence of the musician Flaccus in the *didascaliae*. *ars musica* (also 46, *Ph.* 17) and *studium musicum* (*Hau.* 23), however, also refer more broadly in T. to the totality of the dramatist’s craft, i.e. *μουσικός* as the Muses’ business: Cic. *Leg.* 2.38, distinguishing between the characteristic activities of *cavea* and *circus*, says *cavea cantui vigeat ac fidibus et tibiis*. Whether a further allusion is intended to *μουσική*, the Greek cultural amalgam sometimes claimed to underlie Roman literary culture (e.g. Zorzetti 1991), is not so clear. What the audience heard in T.’s phrase might depend on who the audience was. See Introduction 1.2.

24 *spreuissem*: rejection by the leader of the company could end a playwright’s career if he had no other means of getting his play produced. Success required producing plays, not just writing them. ***in praesentia*** ‘at the time’.

Cf. Liv. 21.57.3 *quod unum maximum in praesentia desiderabatur*, ‘the one thing most desired at the time’; *Hau.* 962, *Ad.* 222.

25 in deterrendo: sc. *poetam a scribendo*. **operam sumere** ‘to make an effort’. Also *Hau.* 693 *frustra operam, opinor, hanc sumo*, ‘I think I’m wasting my time here.’

26 in otio . . . in negotio: a similar juxtaposition at *Ad.* 20 (of T.’s aristocratic supporters) *quorum opera in bello in otio in negotio*, perhaps not surprising since both prologues were spoken on the occasion of Paullus’ funeral. The idea ran deep in contemporary thought, e.g. Enn. *Iph.* 195–6J *otio qui nescit uti plus negoti habet quam cum est negotium in negotio*, ‘He who does not know how to use leisure has more work than when his business is in business.’ So too the remark attributed to Africanus by Cic. *Off.* 3.1 (citing Cato as source) *numquam se minus otiosum esse quam cum otiosus*.

27 ne alias scriberet: T. generally introduces clauses of prevention, a kind of negative purpose, with *ne* or *quin*, never *quominus* (but *minus iam quo* at 630). Cf. *Ph.* 3 (of T.’s rival) *maledictis detertere ne scribat parat*, ‘He tries by slanders to keep him from writing’ (*NLS* §150 n.i.). Ambivius claims a significant power. At Athens, poets secured production of their plays by direct decision of the archon, who was responsible for deciding which poets ‘received a chorus’, but at Rome contracts went not to poets but to the troupe managers. Roman poets thus required an intermediary like Ambivius: failure to secure one could end a career (Introduction 1.1).

28 meā causa: because in words of iambic shape (like *mā*) the natural accent falls on the first syllable, the second syllable may be scanned as light, a process called iambic shortening and a good example of how the scansion of dramatic verse reflects (and can then be used to recall) the natural tendencies of pronunciation. Instances of iambic shortening are noted in the text. Ambivius’ logic is characteristically Roman: his long service in entertaining audiences has earned him their *gratia*, which thus entitles him to a sympathetic hearing ‘on my account’.

aequo animo attendite ‘listen with an open mind’, a version of the *captatio benevolentiae* traditionally found toward the end of a prologue, e.g. *An.* 24, *Hau.* 35, *Ph.* 30. Having won a hearing for *himself*, Ambivius now seeks to win a hearing for the play.

29 Hecyram: Ambivius turns to the business at hand. Allusions to the initial failure in 165 closely echo the thought and language of the first prologue. **per**

silentium ‘in peace’ (*OLD* 6). Ancient audiences were rarely silent, even when attentive. Quick to express their emotions, they readily made their feelings known. For their behaviour, cf. Pl. *Am.* 64–85 and *Poen.* 17–35, and for their comparable response to tragedy, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.106, *Fin.* 5.63, *De or.* 2.193. See Introduction 1.2.

30 numquam: a first hint of more than one failure. **licitumst:** deponent perf., like *placitae sunt* (21). See 837n. **ita:** 4n.

32 sedabit ‘mitigate’ (*OLD* 2d). **nostrae industriae** ‘our hard work’; cf. *Ad. 25 poetae ad scribendum augeat industriam* ‘to encourage the poet’s effort in writing’. Ambivius emphasizes that the play’s troubles are due to neither internal flaws nor faulty execution by the company.

33 primum ‘for the first time’ (*OLD* 3), i.e. at the Megalensia of 165. **agere** ‘to present’, since the word can mean either ‘produce’ or ‘act’. Ambivius is deliberately vague. **pugilum gloria** ‘talk of boxers’ (Barsby), taking *gloria* = *rumor*. Cf. Cic. *Inv.* 2.166 *gloria est frequens de aliquo fama cum laude*, ‘Gloria is widespread, positive talk about a person.’ Ancient boxing, whose participants wore stiff leather gloves, was a brutal, bloody sport (Poliakoff 1987: 68–88), though the spiked Roman *caestus* they are sometimes thought to have worn is only a scholarly fiction (Lee 1997). The detail may imply that the audience’s taste was one reason for the play’s failure. Cf. the sneer at H. *Ep.* 2.1.185–6 *media inter carmina poscunt | aut ursum aut pugiles; his nam plebecula gaudet*, which is sometimes thought to echo this passage. Cicero’s neat distinction at *Leg.* 2.38 locating athletic competitions in the circus (*cursu et pugillatu et luctatione curricularum equorum*) and musical shows in the cavea evidently had exceptions.

34 eodem ‘to that same place’, taken closely with *funambuli*. There runs through both prologues the idea that a variety of activities either took place in or were visible from the place where plays were performed. **expectatio** = *desiderium* (Don.), the mate of *gloria* above. This echo of 4–5 disrupts the sequence of nouns from *gloria* to *clamor* that provides the subjects of *fecere*. Some editors therefore consider it an interpolation, though an ancient one since known to Porphyrio in the third century CE (ad Hor. *S.* 1.10.28).

35 comitum conuentus ‘a crowd of supporters’. It is impossible to know whether the *comites* are simply devotees of boxing (*OLD* 3) or the retainers of an aristocrat (*OLD* 4b), whose entourage created a commotion as he made his way to a seat. **mulierum**: the presence of women at the shows is well documented. Pl. *Poen.* 28–35 refers explicitly to *nutrices* and *matronae* in attendance. (The *scortum exoletum* of *Poen.* 17 is probably male.)

36 fecēre: T. shows a slight preference for this 3 pl. perf. termination, while Pl. much prefers *-ērunt*. Poets from Ennius on favoured *-ēre*, as did Cato in his speeches, though Cic. *Or.* 157 calls *-ērunt* ‘more correct’ (*uerius*). Details in Weiss 2009: 393–4. **ante tempus**, i.e. ‘early’, though how much of the play was performed remains unspecified. **exirem foras**: *ex*-compounds + *foras* are common in T., e.g. *exire foras*, *excludere foras*, *egredi foras*, *educere foras*, and probably colloquial. The phrase normally signals an entrance, e.g. *Hau.* 1000 *senex exit foras* ‘The old man is coming out’, but here Ambivius means just the opposite since he is forced to leave the stage.

37 uetere . . . consuetudine: his practice of sticking with troubled plays, as he did for Caecilius, until they win the success they deserve. **in noua:** sc. *fabula*, recalling *planest pro noua*, 5. **uti:** inf. The result follows.

38 in experiundo ut essem = *ut experier*. **refero:** hist. pres. verbs in T. are invariably set in narratives that also include perf. verbs. The sequence ends with *potui* (42). Other exx. at 826–32, *Hau.* 121–41, *Ph.* 862–7. This revival is for Paullus' funeral in 160, where it was performed along with *Ad.* Private patronage – the programme was set by Paullus' sons, not the aediles – may have given the troupe more discretion in the choice of plays.

39 primo actu: 'initially', early in the performance; cf. *Ad.* 9 *in prima fabula* 'early in the play' and 822n. A necessarily vague expression, since Roman plays did not have act divisions. **placeo:** Ambivius probably speaks as producer, not actor. He is more likely to have played Laches than Parmeno (the exit and immediate entrance at 197–8 preclude an actor from playing both roles), which would mean that he did not appear until what our texts call the second act. **uenit:** hist. pres. since the last foot of a senarius must be iambic. In early Latin, the indic. is normal in *quom*-clauses of all types (*NLS* §231).

40 gladiatores: the main entertainment at aristocratic funerals, which provided the primary chance to see gladiators in Republican Rome. Paullus' sons spent over thirty talents on them, a lavish sum duly recorded (Polyb. 31.28.5–7, Diod. 31.27.6). External accounts of the funeral make no mention of T.'s plays. **populu' conuolat** 'a crowd gathered.' cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.55.68 *ex aliis alii conuolant* 'people came together from all sides'. This is certainly a new crowd attracted by the rumour, not the audience already gathered to watch the play (Sandbach 1982). Gladiators and actors necessarily shared the space available for funerals in the forum (Introduction 3.1). Whether the fiasco described here was accidental, the result of a cabal by T.'s enemies (Gilula 1981), or never more than a fiction to arouse sympathy from the latest audience (Gruen 1992: 213–15) remains uncertain. It is hard to imagine how the sons of Paullus, who had famously said that a good general also had to be a good impresario (Liv. 45.32.11, cf. Polyb. 30.14), could have tolerated such a fiasco at their show in his honour – or why a similar attempt was not made at the performance of *Ad.* on the same occasion.

41 The verbs in asyndeton suggest the excitement and confusion of the occasion.

42 meum . . . locum: 'my position', with a vaguely military ring (*OLD* 5d) suited to the struggle around him. The fight for places means that Ambivius cannot keep *his* place, viz. on the stage.

43 nunc: i.e. the third attempt to produce the play, thought to be the *ludi Romani* in September 160. **turba** 'commotion' (*OLD* 1), the opposite of *otium* 'tranquillity' (*OLD* 4c).

44 tempus ‘opportunity’, meaning a time to do something (*OLD* 9).

45 potestas ‘opportunity’, meaning the power to bring something about (*OLD* 6). **condecorandi ludos scaenicos**: ‘to add lustre to the dramatic festivals’ (Barsby). The gerund readily takes acc. obj. in early Latin, e.g. Pl. *St.* 281 *potestas adipiscendist gloriam*, T. *An.* 806 *spatium exquirendi meum factum* (*NLS* §206 n. ii.). *ludi scaenici* is widely regarded, probably correctly, as the technical term for Roman festivals with plays attached, but this seems to be the earliest surviving appearance of the term in a Latin text.

46 per uos ‘by your agency’ (*OLD* 15). **artem musicam**: 23n. Ambivius now puts the case rather grandly by arguing for the future of art generally, not just the career of T.

47 recidere ad paucos ‘fall into the hands of a few’ (*OLD* 3b), i.e. those whose inattention or disregard for drama disrupted earlier attempts to stage the play. These are often taken to be a clique surrounding Luscius Lanuvinus, which deliberately tried to sabotage T.’s productions and end his career (e.g. Mattingly 1959: 166–7, Gilula 1981: 30–4), though a more general reading is equally possible. There is in either case a clear implication that T. could claim a popular following.

47–8 uostra auctoritas . . . meae auctoritati: further word play based on different senses of the same word (*paronomasia*), i.e. the audience’s influence (*OLD* 7) will aid and support his guidance (*OLD* 5).

49 numquam auare: Ambivius has never compromised by seeking a quick profit at the price of artistic integrity or cheated a poet by buying cheap a play that he could then sell dear to the aediles; cf. 57n. **pretium statui** ‘set a price’ (*OLD* 9c), with dat. of the thing valued (*arti*).

50 quaestum . . . maxumum: the greatest profit, he maintains, is not measured in coin. The *captatio* grows ever more elaborate, from appealing to the audience’s *potestas* and *auctoritas* (44–8) to saying that the greatest satisfaction is in serving their interests (49–51). **in animum induxi**: 292n.

51 quam maxume: another rhetorically effective repetition. The inf. phrase is in apposition to *quaestum*. **uostis commodis** ‘your interests’ (*OLD* 2).

52 impetrare: followed, as often, with a neg. cl. of purpose, *ne . . . inuideant* (54). The obj. of that cl. (*eum*) is first introduced here with the following rel. **in tutelam meam**: Ambivius casts himself as T.’s protector and patron. The *auctoritas* he has so elaborately claimed for himself is now used for T.’s benefit.

53 studium: 19n. **in uostram . . . fidem**: writing to serve the public makes T. its client with a claim to its *fides*. Cf. *Eu.* 1039 *Thais patri se commendauit in clientelam et fidem*. The problem of good faith, dependency, and obligation raised

in this immediate context is not, however, limited to the prologue. The play itself opens with a question of fidelity (*quam paucos reperias . . . fidelis*, 58–9) that in various manifestations develops thematic significance (cf. 109, 112–14, 402, 472–4, 581, 750, 871).

54 circumuentum ‘cheated’ (*OLD* 5), viz. of his right to a hearing for his play. **iniqui**: i.e. the *pauci* of 47. The wordplay in the last half of the line is noteworthy.

55 causa causam: one final bit of wordplay, this one on two senses of *causa* in two grammatical cases. The return from military to legal language brings the end of the prologue in line with its beginning (*orator uenio . . .*, 9).

56 aliis: sc. other new authors to be encouraged (or potentially dissuaded) by T.’s experience. The *palliata* tradition did not in fact produce subsequent dramatists of comparable originality. The best, Turpilius, seems to have written in what was by the later second century an old-fashioned style. See Wright 1974: 153–81. **discere**: 14n.

57 expediat ‘it’s useful’ (*OLD* 8); cf. *Hau.* 388 *expedit bonas esse uobis*, ‘It’s in your interest to be good.’ **pretio emptas meo**: *Eu.* 20 speaks of the aediles buying the play, but leaves unclear whether their transaction was with playwright or producer. Ambivius suggests here and at 49 that he buys scripts from the poets, thus incurring for himself a financial risk if the aediles do not then fund production of the scripts he now owns.

THE PLAY

I.i: Philotis, Syra (58–75)

Having abandoned the expository function of the prologue, T. must instead stage his exposition. The empty street and the three house doors that face us remain anonymous until two women emerge from the centre set of doors and gradually bring the scene to life as we overhear their conversation. They will turn out to be what ancient grammarians called ‘protatic’ characters (πρόσωπα προτατικά ‘characters to make a point’), figures introduced solely to create an initial, expository dialogue, like Sosia in *Andria* and Davus in *Phormio* (Don. ad *An.* 28, Duckworth 1952: 108–9). Though created for this purely technical function, these two women are not entirely colourless or insignificant in their own right. Philotis, whose professional experience has not yet extinguished her optimism, and the older, distinctly more cynical Syra, will vanish from the scene once their expository role is done, but what they represent will prove to be as important to the play as what they say and what is said to them. A stock scene of old whore instructing her younger counterpart (*Pl. As.* 504–44, *Cist.* 78–81, *Mos.* 184–247) thus gains thematic significance. Cf. Gilula 1980: 153–4, McGarrity 1980/81: 150–1, Sharrock 2009: 242–3.

The two expository scenes, lines 58–197, continue in the unaccompanied spoken metre of the prologues (the iambic senarius), but see 134n.

58 Per pol quam: tmesis of *perquam* ‘extremely’; cf. *An.* 486 *per ecastor scitus*. Colloquial *pol* (and *edepol*), in origin an oath by Pollux, is in T. characteristic of, though not limited to, female speech (e.g. 747): Adams 1984: 50–3, Müller 1997: 142–3. It functions as an emphatic interjection, the emphasis created more by its position than its literal sense. Greek oaths work the same way, e.g. (on a black-figure cup) Θέογνις καλὸς νῆ Δία ‘Theognis sure is handsome’ (Bers 2009: 108–14). Oaths bring the naturalness of conversation to the formalities of comic verse, though Pl. might exploit even so ‘natural’ a feature for comic effect (e.g. *Capt.* 880–5). **paucos:** Don., noting that some read *paucis* here, quotes Apollodorus’ *Hekyra*, ὀλίγαις ἐραστῆς γέγον’ ἐταίραισιν, Σύρα, | βέβαιος, ‘A steadfast lover, Syra, comes to few hetairai’ (*PCG*, fr. 8). If the MSS are right, T. has shifted the emphasis of his model from sympathy for hetairai to the criticism of their lovers, but the closeness of his translation is in other respects very striking. Apollodorus’ play must also have begun with two similar characters in a similar conversation, though his Syra may only have been a mute part (Sewart 1974: 250–1, Lowe 1983: 437–8). The first speaker is not identified as Philotis until 81–2, when use of the name is most natural. **reperias:** the potential subj. with an indefinite 2nd pers. sing. is common in generalizing statements, e.g. *An.* 460 *fidelem haud ferme mulieri inuenias uirum* (*NLS* §119). The verb and oath enhance the conversational tone of what in Apollodorus was a more formal, even gnomic statement.

59 fidēlis . . . amatores: the acc. pl. adj. is predicative, i.e. ‘turn out faithful’; Cf. *Ph.* 705 *quot res postilla monstra euenerunt mihi!* The inconstancy of *meretrices*, not of their lovers, is the more common complaint in comedy, e.g. Phaedria’s famous lament at *Eu.* 46–56. Philotis’ reversal of the norm signals at once the play’s interest in presenting unexpected perspectives.

60 uel ‘for example’. **hic:** Philotis gestures toward Laches’ house, thus beginning the formal exposition. With *Bacchidi*, the inhabitant of the second house becomes clear and, by implication, the nature of the business transacted there. As becomes explicit at 97, Philotis is responding to what she has learned inside from Bacchis. The natural word accent on the first syllable of Pámphilus allows the pron. *hic* (*OLD* 1d) to scan as a light syllable despite the double consonant, an example of iambic shortening (28n.).

61 quam sancte, uti: a result clause follows, the verb in secondary sequence since nobody now will make the same mistake. The exclamation is parenthetical: Philotis describes the swearing before explaining what was sworn.

62 illa uiua: ablative absolute. **ducturum:** understand *esse* and *se*. Their omission lends a colloquial feel to the language, cf. Pl. *Cist.* 98 *iurauit . . . me uxorem*

ducturum esse, where only the acc. obj. needs to be expressed. See de Melo 2007: 149–54. For the vocab. of marriage, see Treggiari 1991a: 166–7.

63 em: often a demonstrative adverb implying some kind of gesture (e.g. *Eu.* 237–8 *em quo redactus sum* ‘see what I am reduced to’), the word here (and 298) itself provides the emphasis: ‘well!’ ‘guess what?’ It is in origin the truncated imper. of *emere* ‘to take’, producing something like colloquial English ‘get this!’ See Luck 1964: 62, Müller 1997: 115–17.

64 misereat: understand *te* from the preceding clause. This is Don.’s reading. The oldest manuscript of T., the so-called Bembinus codex (A) of perhaps the fourth century CE, reads *misereas*, but personal forms of *misereo* are generally deponent (*OLD* 1). The oldest text does not necessarily preserve the best reading. The hard-bitten Syra has little sympathy for Philotis’ regrets; cf. old Scapha’s scolding of Philematium at Pl. *Most.* 157–90.

65 quin: introduces a clause of negative purpose, a type more often introduced by *quominus* or *ut non* (*NLS* §184n). **spolies . . . laceres:** love in comedy is frequently described in military terms: see Fantham 1972: 26–33. Syra’s tricolon with asyndeton is particularly well suited to her bellicose vocabulary: cf. the triumphal inscription of Acilius Glabrio, *fundit fugat prosternit maximas legiones* (ap. Caesius Bassus, *GLK* vi.265), Naevius, *Bellum Punicum* (fr. 32 Strzelecki), *insulam integram | urit uastat populatur*, and Cic. *Phil.* 14.27, *hostesque . . . prostravit fudit occidit*. This is also the language of Pl.’s clever slaves: Fraenkel 2007: 161–5. **quemque** = *quemcumque*.

66 utine: the interrog. adv. (*uti* + *ne*) suggests a protest. **eximium** ‘spared.’ Properly, says Don., this is a pig separated from the rest (*eximo* ‘take away’), fattened, and reserved for sacrifice. (So too Macr. *Sat.* 3.5.6 *in sacrificiis uocabulum*, citing Verg. *G.* 4.538, 550 *quattuor eximios . . . tauros*.) Philotis’ word choice thus seems especially apt, though Don. seems unaware of the irony.

67 nemo . . . quisquam: a colloquial pleonasm, as is the parenthetical *scito* ‘rest assured’ that follows.

68 quin . . . paret: as in classical Latin, the conj. *quin* (in origin instrumental *qui* + *-ne*) does the work of *qui non* in introducing a generic clause: *OLD* 6, cf. *NLS* §187 (e). **abs te:** with *expleat*. T. commonly thrusts an emphatic word or phrase to the beginning of its clause (which here, despite *ita*, is a clause of purpose). This is the usual spelling of the preposition before *te* in Pl. and T.

69 suam: synizesis is common with the possessive adj. The return to iambic rhythm after the line’s dactylic opening puts a slight emphasis on *suam uoluptatem*. The apparent licence of dramatic scansion does not lack dramatic reason.

70 hiscin = *his* + *ce* + *ne*. Comedy often attaches the demonstrative suffix *-ce* to a pron. **amabo:** frequently ‘please’, but here a weaker, slightly wheedling

modifier, e.g. ‘dear’. It is an exclusively female expression in T., though not in later Latin (Hall 2009: 80–1). The male equivalent is *sodes* (*si* + *audes*): Adams 1984: 61–5, Müller 1997: 94–7, Dutsch 2008: 50–3. **contra** ‘in return’ (OLD 7). **insidiabere**: 2nd pers. sing. T. employs only the 2nd pers. pass. in *-re*, while the classical ending *-ris* occurs, though rarely, in Pl. (9 examples).

71 eandem: the emphatic word is again thrust ahead of its clause.

72 autem: the adverb suggests indignation, as does the repetition of *iniurium*, cf. 100 and *Ad.* 940 *promisi ego illis. :: promisti autem?* (OLD 6). **aduorsarios**: military language again. Syra maintains her combative attitude toward what less cynical advisors might call *amatores*, as Philotis did at 59. The war between the sexes is programmatic, as again in Laches’ belief that wives always strive to be *uiris aduorsas* (202).

73 captent ‘they try to capture’, a ‘conative’ present indicating an action attempted or begun but not completed, cf. *Ad.* 144 *quom placo, aduorsor sedulo et deterreo*, where Don. glosses *cum uolo placere*, i.e. ‘when I try to appease him . . .’ There may be another conative example at 293 below. The verb is rare in T. and always figurative: adopting a plan (*An.* 170, 404), overhearing a conversation (*Ph.* 869). The literal sense ‘capture’ is reserved for *capio*. **eadem**: sc. *via*. As at 69, synizesis at a sense boundary.

74 eheu: an exclamation of regret. It can stand alone (e.g. *Hau.* 83 *quid de te tantum meruisti? :: eheu!*) or, as here, be followed by an exclamatory accusative (e.g. *Ph.* 187 *eheu me miserum!*) A common variant is *heu*, as at 271, *heu me miseram!* See Müller 1997: 137. Don. comments interestingly: *intellegit enim ex uultu eius non se persuasisse quod uohuit*. (Similar references to facial expression appear in his notes on *An.* 552, 753, *Eu.* 224, 274, 499, 523, 948, *Ph.* 184, *Hec.* 468, *Ad.* 852, 907, but not *Eu.* 670.) He may have the memory of a private reading in mind: what *ex uultu* can mean in respect to performance by masked actors raises important technical questions about the expressivity of masks and the style of acting they require. See Jakobi 1996: 8–14, Monaghan 2002, Marshall 2006: 155–8, and for the old controversy over the use of masks on the Roman stage, Beare 1964: 303–09. **quor**: the spelling *cur* did not take hold until the late Republic. Always a monosyllable with a long vowel. **istaec**: archaic *ista* + *-ce* ‘that of yours’, contrasted with *haec* ‘this of mine’ below. Masc. and neut. forms are *istic* and *istuc*.

75 sententia ‘knowledge’. Youth, thinks Syra, is wasted on the young.

I.ii: Parmeno, Philotis, Syra (76–197)

The convention in ancient texts was to start a new scene when a character enters, even if, as here, the action is continuous. Parmeno emerges from Laches’ house, still speaking to a slave (Scirtus) invisible inside. Conversation back through the door was a standard technique for blurring the boundary between seen and

unseen space, thus making an entrance appear more natural. (Contrast 719–21, where a slave actually comes out of the house when summoned.) Philotis and Syra continue their conversation in dumb show as attention shifts to Parmeno. He will not notice them until 81.

76 Senex: not identified as Laches until 134. Parmeno speaks familiarly (and presumptuously) of his master behind his back. **isse dicito:** understand *me*. See 62n. The fut. imper., with its echo of legal texts and precepts (e.g. XII Tab. 1 *si in ius uocat, ito*, Pl. *Truc.* 295 *moribus uiuito antiquis*), may be another mark of Parmeno's self-importance. Further such indications follow.

77 percontatum: the acc. supine with a verb of motion is one of Latin's most concise ways of expressing purpose. It was colloquial, though unlike the inf. in a similar construction (e.g. 189 *it uisere*), it also appears in formal prose (*NLS* §152). Parmeno here suggests a legitimate reason for his absence from the house. He sounds like another clever slave preparing to deceive his master, but this turns out to be no false excuse. Though coy about his destination here and at 194, he really *is* going to the harbour to seek news of Pamphilus, a fact confirmed by their joint entry at 281. Parmeno will never be quite the *seruus callidus* he aspires to be. **Pamphili:** T. works the necessary proper names into the exposition as naturally as possible.

78 audin = audisne. **Scirte:** Don. comments on the appropriateness of this name for a young slave παρὰ τὸ σκιρτῶσαι 'because of his leaping about'. It is a real slave name at Sal. *Orat. Lep.* 21. **uti:** the conj. introduces Parmeno's instruction without need for an explicit verb of command.

79 tum '(only) then'. The preceding condition must first be fulfilled. **nullu' dixeris** 'nothing at all' (*OLD* 6). The neg., with adverbial force, is emphatic, while the perf. subjunc. produces a more peremptory command than *noli* + infinitive, well suited to Parmeno's sense of superiority (*NLS* §128).

80 alias (adv.) 'on another occasion'. Word order is inverted for emphasis. **causa** 'excuse'. **integra:** i.e. unspoiled by previous use. The adjective is predicative. At *Ad.* 10 T. famously described a Greek scene left untranslated by Plautus (and thus available for adaptation by a later poet) as a *locum integrum*. Parmeno's precaution again suggests the *seruus callidus*.

81 Parmeno now turns from the door and notices the two women. Delayed recognitions like this are common in Roman comedy and something of an innovation: comparison of *Bac.* 530–9 and *Men. Dis exapaton* 103–10 shows how Pl. transformed a naturalistic encounter to the elaborate formality his own audience enjoyed. See Bain 1977: 142–4, Goldberg 1990: 109–201. The convention is sometimes ascribed to the (presumed) width of the Roman stage, which could put considerable distance between characters, but the comic potential of the convention makes so rational an explanation unnecessary, even beside the point.

The improbability of the delay is part of the joke. This particular situation is less artificial than most: T. tends to avoid the exaggerated, stylized effects in which Plautus delights. **Philotium:** neut. acc., the Latin diminutive of *Philotis*. Names in this form are common among Plautine *meretrices* (e.g. *Philocomasium*, *Acroteleutium*, *Phoenicium*), but *Glycerium* (from *Glykera*) of *An.*, a citizen child raised in a *meretrix*'s household, is the only other example of such a name in T. In Greek comedy, diminutives of proper names are often used 'tactically', adding tone more than sense (Dover 2002: 88–9). Here and at 197 the diminutive may suggest either affection or condescension. **unde:** the surprised question implies that she has been only visiting Bacchis. He has not seen her in two years (87). **aduenit:** pres. tense. The final foot of a senarius must be a pure iamb.

83 mecastor: a woman's oath (*me Castor iuuet*), as is *ecastor* (Müller 1997: 144), while the oath by Pollux (58n.) is used by both. So Gell. 11.6, on Varro's authority. Syra calls attention to herself. Don. heard a note of mockery in Parmeno's echoing reply, *mecastor, Parmeno.* :: *edepol, Syra.* Parmeno throughout has eyes and ears only for the younger woman. This will in fact be Syra's last line in the play, though her cynical view of life lingers. Having entered in company with Philotis, she probably remains on stage with her until their joint exit at 197. An exit here would be both unmotivated and potentially disruptive, *pace* Gilula 1979: 529. See also Prescott 1937: 197–8, Sewart 1974: 252 n. 18, Lefèvre 1999: 43.

84 oblectasti: the syncopated perf. is conversational. Comic vocabulary tends toward the colourful: as Don. remarks, not 'where have you been?' but 'where have you been amusing yourself?' Thus *reperias*, not *sunt* in 58. See in general Palmer 1961: 76–7.

85 equidem: derivation from *ego + quidem* is doubtful (e.g. *OLD* s.v., Solodow 1978: 19–29), but *Eu.* 956 is its only appearance in T. with anything other than a 1st pers. verb. **mē oblectaui:** Don. prefers this scansion since the hiatus allows Philotis' echo of *te oblectasti* to be heard distinctly. Clarity of diction could be a problem in the large stone theatres of the empire (cf. Vit. 5.3.4). There may have been fewer such difficulties in the smaller, improvised theatrical spaces of T.'s day, but that does not obviate the dramatist's need to give his actors speakable lines.

86 Corinthum: the city was so famous for loose living that the poets of Old Comedy coined a verb, *κορινθιάζεσθαι*, for consorting with prostitutes. Plays called *Κορινθιαστής* 'The Corinthian Corrupter' are attested for Poliochos and Philetairos, Aristophanes' youngest son (Athen. 7.313c, 13.559a), and Corinth figures prominently in the sneering account of Neaera's early career at [Dem.] 59.26–32. The contrast implied below between Athens and Corinth may thus reflect the Athenian bias of T.'s model. Whether Roman audiences were aware of, or shared, such cultural nuances is an open question. T. is sometimes thought to have generalized specific Greek names in his models – so Menander's Ἀλγισί

(an Athenian deme) becomes *in his regionibus* at *Hau.* 63 (Haffter 1953: 80–4) – but references to Imbros (171n.) and the friend from Myconos (440n.) show T.’s ease with geographic specificity when there is dramatic gain. **hinc:** sc. from Athens, or so we presume. The scene is never explicitly identified. Philotis has endured the kind of sojourn abroad with a soldier that Plautus’ Planesium (*Cur.*) and Phoenicium (*Ps.*) are eager to avoid. **inhumanissimo:** what is *humanum* (Menander’s ἀνθρώπινος) is what distinguishes people from beasts or insensate things, cf. *An.* 236 and 214 below. (For the expanded sense of *homo/humanus* in T., see 555n.) The soldier evidently lacked the civilized virtues, as comic soldiers commonly do. For the type, usually boastful, boorish, and stupid, see Hanson 1965, Nesselrath 1990: 325–9, Brown 2004, Mastromarco 2009. Gruen 1990: 129–40 examines the literary figure’s relevance to contemporary Roman concerns.

87 biennium . . . perpetuom ‘two whole years,’ acc. of duration (*NLS* §10). **misera** ‘in misery’. The adjective in apposition has adverbial force.

88 te desiderium: obj. and subj. respectively of *cepisse. desiderium* (πρόθος), like *cupida* at 91, takes an obj. gen., as *Cic. Att.* 3.22.3, *Fam.* 7.6.1, *Pis.* 32.

90 contempsisse ‘came to regret’. Philotis must have gone to Corinth under a contract (thus *consilium*) of her own making. She is a free agent, not a slave.

92 uosque . . . uiuendi: a trans. gerund with acc. obj. is common in early Latin, although replacement by the more familiar gerundive in agreement with the noun is already found in Pl., e.g. *Capt.* 88g *liberorum quaerundorum caussa. antiqua:* not ‘old-fashioned’ (as *Ad.* 440 *homo antiqua uirtute ac fide*) but simply ‘former’ (cf. *Ad.* 812 *rationem antiquam*).

93 agitare ‘spend time in’. **libere**, i.e. free from her obligation to the soldier.

94 illi: all MSS of T. read *illic*, which does not scan. Don. prefers *illi* ‘at that place’. This form of the adverb (*illic* = *illi* + *-ce*) is early but remained in colloquial use (Caelius, a brisk and fashionable stylist, uses it in a letter to Cicero, *Fam.* 8.15.2). **nisi praefinito** ‘only when prescribed’. T. uses the perf. part. adverbially, e.g. *An.* 533 *optato aduenis* ‘I’m glad you’ve come’, cf. *An.* 807, *Ph.* 756. Don. explains the construction here as an abl. abs. with a noun like *tempore* omitted, so *NLS* §93(2), but adverbs in *-o* like *consulto*, *merito*, and *falso*, though derived from ablatives, are not necessarily ‘absolute’ in origin. Cf. *peccato*, 737n. (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 104–5).

95 illi: i.e. to the soldier. Philotis dared speak only when and what pleased him. **placerent:** the subjunc. signals a clause of characteristic (*NLS* §155). **haud opinor:** this might be an ironic aside, since Philotis is clearly a woman fond of expressing herself. Comic soldiers were themselves notoriously garrulous, though their own valour was the preferred subject.

96 statuisse: the verb of command suits the soldier. The more prosaic phrase *finem facere* appears at *An.* 821, *Hau.* 34, *Ph.* 22–23, *Ad.* 997.

97 hoc negotist: the gen. defines the pron., the ‘gen. of the rubric’ (*NLS* §72(5) n. ii). The *negotium* in question is in fact the situation that sets the plot in motion: Philotis’ questions now lead to the formal exposition. T.’s care here in fleshing out his protatic characters is striking. Each has a distinct personality, and Philotis’ need and desire to be told what has come between Bacchis and Pamphilus is effectively motivated by her long absence and sympathetic nature. Contrast the relatively colourless Sosia of *Andria* (a Terentian addition) and Davus of *Phormio* (Apollodorus’ creation), who fulfil comparable expository functions in a more mechanical way.

98 hic intus: reminding us which is Bacchis’ house. Philotis had two years’ worth of news to catch up on, which may explain why she could not get all the details inside. The phrase makes clear that the women entered from this third house. Their entrance in Apollodorus may have been from the harbour. So Lowe 1983: 449–50, noting that a backdrop with two houses was the apparent norm on the Athenian stage. **quod:** obj. of *credidi*, explained by the following *ut*-clause. The vagueness of the reference facilitates the easy progression from *hoc* to *quae* to *quod*; the punctuation represents possible inflections, not firm syntactic boundaries. Philotis repeats to Parmeno what she had said to Syra (61–2), but Parmeno offers a better informed response.

100 habere autem: the particle makes this a question. cf. Micio’s initial response at *Ad.* 934 to the suggestion that he marry, *me ducere autem?* Parmeno plays on the ambiguity of *habeo* ‘to have a wife’ (*OLD* 5b) and ‘to treat as a wife’ (*OLD* 24a). **eho:** the interjection often precedes an indignant question introduced, as here, by *an* (Müller 1997: 105–6).

101 habet: a language without a word for ‘yes’ will develop other affirming strategies. Anaphora, either of the first word of the preceding sentence or, as here, of its verb, is the most common such strategy in comedy. See Thesleff 1960: 12–17, Müller 1997: 191–2. **firmae haec . . . nuptiae:** a first hint that the plot will centre not on Pamphilus and Bacchis but on Pamphilus and his wife. Fem. nom. pl. *haec* (i.e. *hae* + *ce*) is the *lectio difficilior*. Don. and all MSS save one read *hae*, but *haec* is far the more common form in T. Old Latin did not yet consistently distinguish this fem. pl. from the neut. pl. **ut:** *ne non*, says Don. helpfully. Introduction of a negative fear clause by *ut* could apparently confuse even fourth-century students.

102 faxint: this form was long explained as an archaic perf. subjunc. (in origin a sigmatic aorist) of *facio* (cf. *dixi*, *iunxi*) but is increasingly recognized as based on an *s*-present (desiderative) stem. See Meiser 1998: 182–3, de Melo 2007: 306–14. The sigmatic subjunc. was obsolete by the second century, largely confined, as here, to a handful of formal contexts like prayers and imprecations: de Melo

2007: 192–215. **in rem** ‘to the advantage of’ (*OLD* 13b). Philotis, as at 160 below, naturally identifies with Bacchis. There is more compassion than spite in her response to Parmeno’s news.

103 quī: an interrog. adv. (an Old Latin instrumental), here ‘why?’ (sometimes ‘how?’). The *-i* is long by nature, but rather than eliding with the following vowel, it shortens here and the syllable is then scanned as light, a process called prosodic hiatus. Iambic shortening then lightens the following syllable (i.e. *īstuc*) as well. **īstuc . . . ita:** subj. and pred. respectively of *esse* (74n., thus *īstūc*, not adv. *īstūc*). The question precedes the command on which, syntactically, it depends, another colloquial touch.

104 prolato ‘to be made public’. When the need is for an action, T. follows *opus est* with a perf. part. (so 431, 865, *Ph.* 716, 1003, *Ad.* 601, 996) or even an abl. supine (*Hau.* 941). Philotis’ echo of these words, *hoc proferam*, at 107 encourages punctuation here after *hoc*, not after *prolato*, though both are grammatically possible. **percontarier:** this archaic but metrically convenient form of the pres. pass. inf. almost always in T., and always in Plautus, appears at the end of the line. See Karakasis 2005: 51–2.

105 nempe ‘I suppose’ (*OLD* 3b), not ironic. Philotis appreciates the need for discretion. **ut ne:** introduces a neg. purpose clause, though *ne* alone, as in classical Latin, is more common in this situation.

106 ita me di amabant: a favourite formula of asseveration in T. (23 examples, only 19 in the much larger Plautine corpus) used by both men and women. The wish is more commonly expressed by the pres. subjunc. (*ament*), e.g. 206, 233, 258 below. See Müller 1997: 146–7. **propterea:** anticipates *uti*. *haud* will be answered by *sed*.

107 mecum ‘alone’ (*OLD* 15). Philotis relishes the idea of private knowledge.

108 commode ‘agreeably’ (*OLD* 5). **meum tergum:** T.’s allusions to slave punishment are rare and mild (cf. *An.* 196–9, about as graphic as he gets) compared to Pl.’s delight in the language of torture, though failure to act on the threats is always part of the joke in comedy. See Parker 1989.

109 tuam in fidem committam: i.e. ‘to entrust you with’; cf. *Eu.* 1039 *Thais patri se commendauit in clientelam et fidem*. Though *fides* is not a quality commonly ascribed to Philotis’ profession, the comment is not necessarily ironic, since Parmeno does tell her what he knows. T. grants even slaves an interior ethical life, as e.g. Syrus slyly notes at *Ad.* 422–24. **noli:** sc. *dicere* (‘don’t say that!’). Philotis knows perfectly well that Parmeno is keen to tell his story. Don. nevertheless thinks she is feigning indifference (i.e. *noli narrare*) so she will be thought more discreet.

111 scire: sc. *uolo*. **haec:** demons. pron., probably accompanied by a gesture. The line is best delivered as a genuine aside spoken out front to the audience, not simply as a private thought spoken aloud. Parmeno’s passion for control

embraces the audience, too, which he consistently seeks to take into his confidence. For the problem of establishing rapport with the audience, see 274–80n.

113 ingenium ‘character’. Parmeno’s reluctance to speak was out of character. Loquacity, as Don. notes, is a servile vice.

114 istīc: literally adv. of place = ‘I’m with you’ (*OLD* 2b). **hanc Bacchidem** ‘Bacchis here’. The casual gesture again reminds the audience which house is which. We should not assume that the actors remain stationary throughout their conversation: a change in position is especially appropriate now, as Parmeno begins the expository narrative he had feigned reluctance to tell (104). Philotis knows how to coax what she wants from a man, and the stage business here dramatizes her skill.

115 ut quom maxume ‘as much as ever’. The phrase combines adv. *ut* ‘to the extent’ (*OLD* 15d) with the rel. adv. *quom* (*OLD* 13a). **tum**: answered by temporal *quom* in the following line. Parmeno absolves Pamphilus of the charge implied at 58.

116 occipit: historical pres. **pater**: Laches. A similar situation is described from the father’s perspective at *An.* 46–170. For the comparison, see Penwill 2004.

117 haec communia: a second obj. of *orare*. The three infinitive clauses that follow are in apposition. **omnium patrum**: the emphatic word is again thrust ahead of its clause. Parmeno shows no sympathy for his master or his master’s predicament.

119 praesidium: Laches wants legitimate grandchildren to ensure continuation of the household. Thus the pressure applied to his only son (*unicum*).

120 ill’: suppression of final *-e* before a consonant (apocope) is common with the suffix *-ne* (e.g. *hiscin*, 70) but otherwise rare. T. has about a dozen examples of *ill’*. *Ph.* 307 requires *nemp’*. **se negare**: sc. *uxorem ducturum*. A historical inf.

121 instat ‘insists’ (*OLD* 2b). Stronger than *orare*. As Laches presses the argument, Pamphilus wavers. In practice, a Roman father’s power to force a marriage on a reluctant son was limited (Treggiari 1991: 176–80). **animi**: probably felt as a gen. of respect with *incertus* (cf. *Pl. Trin.* 454 *sanus mentis aut animi*), but perhaps locative in origin (cf. *Ad.* 310 *compos animi*).

122 pudorin: thus the lenient Micio of *Ad.* claims that children should be guided by *pudor* and *liberalitas*, not by *metus* (*Ad.* 57–58, cf. *An.* 262). **anne** = *an* + *-ne* introducing the rival claim to Pamphilus’ loyalty. (In Latin, as in modern Italian, both consonants are pronounced, which allows speakers to distinguish between pairs like *anus* and *annus*. The two elements of *anne* would be clearly heard.) The indirect question depends on *incertus*, as at 614 below (*OLD* 10b). Pamphilus’ elegantly expressed dilemma – his choices are grammatically and

phonetically balanced and identical in metrical shape – speaks well for his character: ‘someone capable of feeling *pudor* is *ipso facto* a decent person’, Kaster 1997: 9.

123 tundendo: sc. *auris*, as Pl. *Poen.* 434 *pergin auris tundere?* Don. derives the metaphor from the hammering of metal at a forge, but its origin was largely forgotten by T.’s day. See Fantham 1972: 61–62. **odio:** Laches’ insistence became insupportable (*OLD* 5b). *Hoc est instantia*, says Don., which recalls 121 above. **effecit:** used absolutely. T.’s parataxis puts emphasis on the result reported below.

124 despondit: the initiative stays with Laches. **gnatam:** a common synonym for *filius/a*. Early Latin poetry distinguished between the noun *gnatus/a* and the participle *natus/a*. The distinction, found in comedy, high poetry (*o gnata*, Enn. *An.* 44 Skutsch), and inscriptions (*gnatos duos creauit*, no. 17.5 Courtney) alike, fades in the late Republic (e.g. *dedit natae suae*, 20.3 Courtney). **huius:** the accompanying gesture identifies the third house behind them. The family lives not just in the neighbourhood (*uicinus*) but actually next door (*proximus*). The economy of the stage convention adds pathos to the coming action.

125 usque illud: sc. *tempus*. The narrative focus now shifts to Pamphilus. **ne utiquam:** *non nimis*, says Don.

126 donec: the thought, interrupted by the *postquam*-clause, is completed by *ibi demum* (= *denique*) in 128. **in ipsis nuptiis:** Pamphilus’ acquiescence in principle was threatened by the impending reality of the marriage.

127 paratas: sc. *nuptias*. **quin** = *quominus* in expressions where a hindrance has been removed (*NLS* §187 a). **dari:** the acc. subj. is *moram*. Position of the *quin*-clause creates both the alliteration of *ducat dari* and the chiasm of *paratas [esse] . . . dari*.

128 ita: result clause follows.

129 adesset: the impf. subjunc. indicates a possibility in the past (*NLS* §197). **credo:** parenthetic and therefore outside the tense sequence. **ibi:** either purely temporal (= *tum*) or with a locative connotation (‘then and there’, *OLD* 2). **commiseresceret:** impersonal, constructed with gen. of the source (*eius*) and acc. of the person affected (*Bacchidem*), *NLS* § 209. This is T.’s normal practice, e.g. 64 and *Hau.* 1026 *inopi’ nunc te miserescat mei*. Pacuvius (*Inc.* 391 Ribbeck) as quoted by Serv. ad *Aen.* 11.259 reads *Priamus si adesset ipse eius commiseresceret*, which may well have been altered in transmission among the grammarians and has been plausibly restored as *Priamum si adesset ipsum eius commiseresceret*. So Browne 1931: 213. Since both the form of the statement and the underlying idea – pity by the person least likely to feel pity – are identical, one line may well echo the other. Pacuvius and T. moved in the same literary circles: it is impossible to know which

echoed which, though the scholarly presumption is that comedy may echo (or parody) tragedy but not the reverse.

130 ubiqumque: a temporal conj. in T. constructed with an indic. verb, but see 608n. **spatium** ‘time available for a purpose’ (*OLD* 10), e.g. Pl. *Aul.* 806 *spatium exquirendi*.

131 ut . . . posset: result clause, the imperf. subjunc. emphasizing the logical connection to the preceding clauses (*NLS* §164). **Parmeno:** introduction of direct speech, heightened by lack of *inquit* or other preparation, lends vividness and variety to Parmeno’s narrative. It will prove typical of the feckless *adulescens* that his first words in the play come to us spoken by someone else. See also 148n.

132 perii: the young lover’s typical expression of despair, e.g. *An.* 346 *Daue, perii!*, 872 *perii, pater est!* **egi . . . conieci:** true perf. The bewildered *adulescens* more commonly wonders what he should do (e.g. *Eu.* 46 *quid igitur faciam?*). Pamphilus is confronted with the consequences of what he has done. **malum:** he means his marriage, though both the trouble and his responsibility for it are greater than he knows.

133 miser: the *uox propria* for a young man with a tormented love life. Catul. 8 plays on the convention. Pamphilus’ language is more conventional than his dilemma.

134 at: a common start to an imprecation (*OLD* 11b). The expression that follows reflects a common pattern (e.g. *Hau.* 810). **perduint:** the old pres. optative/subjunc. of *dare*, e.g. *dui, duint*, finds its way by analogy into the paradigm of *perdere*, especially in this formulaic expression, though the ‘regular’ subjunc. *perdant* also appears, e.g. 469 below and *Eu.* 302, *Ph.* 688. See de Melo 2007: 240–61, de Vaan 2008: 182 for the *i*-subjunc. and Müller 1997: 152–4 for the imprecation. **odio:** recalls 123. **Lache:** T. commonly adopts the Gk. voc. for names ending in –es (–ης), though ‘Laches’ (voc.) appears at 263. T. is far more consistent in this respect than Pl.: Gerschner 2002: 179–81. Philotis reserves her anger for the father, not the son, reflecting the spin of Parmeno’s narrative (116–24). From their perspective, what conventional Roman morality would see as right conduct will inevitably be seen as wrong conduct. The metre here is problematic. Lindsay recognized trochees down to the diaeresis at *perduint* and therefore, following some MSS and a citation in the ancient Horatian scholia, printed *cum istoc* and scanned the line as a trochaic septenarius. The alternative reading of the MSS (and Don.), *cum odio isto*, produces instead a very dubious senarius. The momentary shift of rhythm, if Lindsay is right, climaxes Parmeno’s extended narrative (114–33), which then resumes with something closer to dialogue. The tibicen would probably not be required to accompany this isolated septenarius, cf. Pl. *Aul.* 393, *Poen.* 1165 (Moore 2008: 17–19).

135 ut . . . redeam: purpose clause. This metaphoric sense of *redeo* is common in argument and narrative (‘to revert’ *OLD* 4). **ad pauca:** not just few things

but the main things. Parmeno steers the conversation away from Laches and promises respite from an overlong narrative. **deducit:** the more common phrase is *uxorem ducere* ‘to marry’ (OLD 5). The variant (only here and perhaps *Ad.* 694 in T.) makes *uxorem* predicative ‘bring her home as a wife’. Cf. Cic.’s sly pun on *tertia deducta* ‘discounted by a third’ (OLD 14a) and ‘with Tertia procured [sc. for Caesar]’ (OLD 10b) recorded by Suet. *Iul.* 50.2.

136 nocte: abl. of time when (cf. *Ad.* 26 *non rediit hac nocte*). **uirginem:** the caesura after *prima* lends this word appropriate emphasis, with an equally apt emphasis on *non* created by pronunciation of the two consonants. Metre facilitates effective delivery. **attigit:** verbs of touching in Latin can be euphemisms for sexual contact (Adams 1982: 185–87), but probably not in this case. Don. ad *Eu.* 640 distinguishes five steps in the progress of physical love: sight, conversation, touch, kissing, intercourse. So here he glosses *ne attigit quidem* ‘didn’t even touch’.

137 eam: sc. *primam noctem*. **nihilo magis** ‘no different’ (OLD s.v. *magis* 4b). A colloquial phrase: *nihilo* is abl. of degree of difference.

138 una: adv., cf. 131 *mecum una*. **cubuerit:** fut. perf. indic. The meaning is strictly literal, as the following line makes clear.

139 plus: adv. The expected correlate with *ut* is *tam*, but the sound play *plus potus . . . potuerit* clearly appeals to T. *plus* could be justified as = *plus solito*. **potus:** in Roman tradition, a round of drinking parties began the day after the formal ceremony, while at Athens, a wedding feast preceded the bride’s arrival at her new home. As at *An.* 282–98, T.’s allusion to marriage customs reflects Roman practice. See Williams 1958, Treggiari 1991a: 161–70. **ut potuerit:** result clause. The perf. subjunc. marks the logical connection between the preceding situation and its consequence.

140 non ueri simile: Philotis has presumably had ample opportunity to observe the effect of drink on young men and judges Pamphilus by that experience. The immediate falsehood but underlying truth of her judgment looks to the play’s central irony, though the audience is not yet in a position to know this. T.’s limited exposition obscures Pamphilus’ true relation to the comic stereotypes.

142 cupiens: adj. + obj. gen., contrasted with *inuitus*. **duxerat:** the verb is regularly used in Latin both for taking a wife and hiring a prostitute. See Adams 1982: 174–5. T.’s language throughout this passage is extremely delicate, one reason for his eventual popularity as a school text. Don.’s gloss on *inuitus* cites *V. Aen.* 4.361 *Italiam non sponte sequor*, a striking association of ideas on his part.

143 pauculis: perhaps ‘just a few’, though a semantic difference between the diminutive and the normal form can be difficult to discern in colloquial speech. Pl. clearly liked the sound of the diminutive for its own sake, producing phrases like *primulo crepusculo* (*Cas.* 40) and *leonem vetulum . . . edentulum* (*Men.* 864). See Duckworth 1952: 334–5, Palmer 1961: 77–8. T.’s use of diminutives is more

restrained and more likely to be semantically significant, e.g. *meliuscula* at 354 (Karakasis 2005: 31–2).

144 post: adv. with temporal abl. (*OLD* 2b). **me solum seducit:** historic pres. Parmeno stresses his intimacy with his young master, another indication of his self-importance, though something like the claimed intimacy is staged at 281–313.

145 ut ‘how’. Thus Pl. *As.* 367 *narra ut acturi sumus*. Reported statement will follow in the inf. clause *se . . . sperasse*. **siet:** archaic forms of the pres. subjunc. (*siet*, *sies*, *siet*) generally occur at line end, probably for metrical convenience (cf. inf. *percontarier*, 104). They occur within the line only twice in T. (*Hec.* 637, *Ad.* 83). Pamphilus’ declaration is false, though nobody onstage knows this yet.

146 uxorem: predicative. **quām:** prosodic hiatus.

147 sperasse = *sperauisse*. The acc. subj. above is then understood with *posse* as well. A pres. inf. often follows a verb of promising in T. (e.g. *An.* 613, *Eu.* 520, *Ph.* 532), but *posse* leaves him little alternative.

148 quam: i.e. the girl. The following subjunc. verb shows that the clause is causal, the equivalent of *cum eam decrerim* (*NLS* §156). T. is partial to such syncopated forms (*decrerim* = *decreuerim*): there are more of them in his six plays than in all of Pl. Parmeno’s slip into direct speech here is more abrupt than at 131, but is made immediately apparent by what the audience will now recognize from that earlier report as his ‘Pamphilus voice’, an aural equivalent of the editor’s quotation marks. Cf. Quint. 11.1.39 on the orator’s occasional need to speak in other voices, another reminder of why T. was valued as a school text. The subtle demarcation of quoted speech was among the technical refinements of Menander’s comedy (Nünlist 2002: 243–7), though the role of vocal characterization in ancient drama was controversial: Quint. 11.3.91 disapproved of the practice. See Csapo 2002: 135–8, Davis 2003: 55–65.

149 ludibrio: pred. dat. denoting purpose. The inf. clause is the subject of *neque honestum . . . neque utile est* below. An obvious sense of *ludibrium* is ‘laughing-stock’ (cf. 526), but saying this would not be *utile* to the girl is at best jejune. Barsby’s ‘plaything’ catches the sense. So at Anaxandrides, fr. 9.3 (two old men recalling their youth) καὶ τοῦθ’ ἡμέτερον ἦν παίγνιον ‘she too was our little playmate’. Paegnium ‘Toy-Boy’ is a slave name in Pl. *Per.*

150 quin = *quominus*. The subjunc. is consecutive (*NLS* §186). **itidem . . . ut** ‘just as’. **ab suis:** sc. *propinquis*.

152 pium ac pudicum: pred. adj. *pium* toward Bacchis, says Don., and *pudicus* toward the girl. He is clearly not being *pium* toward his father. Philotis, motivated more by the indication of *pietas* than *pudicitia*, retracts the scepticism of 140. **ingenium** ‘character’.

153 hoc . . . proferre ‘to make this public’ (cf. 104 *prolato*). *hoc* may be deliberately vague: *amorem meretricis*, says Don., but the sequence of ideas suggests that Pamphilus means *eam ludibrio haberi*. Restriction of knowledge will emerge as a major theme of the play (866n.). **mi** = ‘mihi’. Pamphilus, characteristically, thinks only of himself. The situation would be more than *incommodum* for his wife.

154 autem: the adv. marks an alternative course of action. Return to her father implies divorce. Pamphilus’ language is deliberately anodyne and more than a little self-serving. **quoi**: i.e. the wife. The form is already archaic, though the spelling survived into the first century CE to distinguish pronunciation of *cui* and *qui* (Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.27). The antecedent here is *eam*, the understood obj. of *reddi*. **nil dicas uitii**: part. gen. The gen. sing. in *-ii* did not become regular in the declension of substantives until the late Augustan period (Ernout 1953: 28–9). The *uitium* in question would be understood by the girl’s family as some compromise of her *pudicitia*. Cf. Amphitruo’s complaint at Pl. *Am.* 811 *quia pudicitiae huius uitium me hinc absente est additum*. For the importance of *pudicitia* when arranging a marriage, see Treggiari 1991a: 105–7. The subjunc. is potential, with a generalized subject, as *reperias* (58).

155 superbum: divorce was easily arranged at Rome, but divorce without cause was frowned upon. Thus in 307 BCE a certain L. Annius incurred the censors’ *nota* for an apparently capricious dismissal of his young wife (Val. Max. 2.9.2). See Watson 1967: 48–56, Treggiari 1991a: 461–5. **hoc**: obj. of *cognouerit*, to which the *non posse* clause is in apposition. **cognouerit**: perf. subjunc. representing what would have been a fut. perf. indic. in a clause independent of *spero*.

156 mecum esse: the language is again deliberately colourless. **abitu-rum**: fut. inf. with the verb of hoping (*spero*). Its subject is *illam*. We have heard Pamphilus claim a conscientious effort to fulfil his obligation first to his father and then to his new wife. Married against his will, he tried to make the best of things, and only once he sees the hopelessness of that task does he seek an escape with least possible harm to the girl. Yet his initial solution is simply to drive her away, thus shifting the burden of decisive action to her alone. Analogous problems for a wife are turned to jokes at Pl. *Mer.* 785–86 and *Rud.* 1046–47, but the situation is more serious for Alcumena in *Am.* and harder for us to read. See Rosenmeyer 1995: 208–11, Dutsch 2008: 153–6.

158 alienum ab sese: a very striking expression. Don. takes it literally because Pamphilus is now a husband, *nam hoc nomen [maritus] a meretricibus alienum est*, but women of Bacchis’ profession rarely shrink from affairs with married men. Erotium of Pl. *Men.* is only the most flagrant of many examples. Yet *alienus* in T. may also indicate estrangement, e.g. *Ph.* 545 *ego vobis, Geta, alienus sum?*, *Ad.* 326 *Aeschinus . . . alienus est ab nostra familia*. This is most likely a first hint that Pamphilus

began transferring his affections, somewhat to his own surprise, from Bacchis to his wife.

159 *maligna . . . procax*: normal behaviour for the *meretrix mala* of comic stereotype, the stereotype by which Parmeno judges Bacchis; cf. *Hau.* 227 (of another Bacchis) *meast potens procax magnifica sumptuosa nobilis*. He implies that she became more expensive, though the true motive for her coldness turns out to be quite different. Delay of *et* enhances the alliterative effect of the line: *multo mage* can be understood with both adjectives. ***ilico*** ‘at once’ (*OLD* 2). Contrast Bacchis’ own version of these events at 731–60 and of her motive, 835–40. Neither Parmeno’s own motive nor his knowledge is above suspicion.

160 *non edepol mirum*: Philotis is hardly surprised by Bacchis’ reaction. For the asseverating oath by Pollux, see 83n. ***atque*** ‘what is more’ (*OLD* 1b). This is Don.’s alternative to *atqui* of the MSS, which reading would have Parmeno more explicitly brush aside Philotis’ sympathy for Bacchis (*OLD* 2). The difference in nuance is slight. ***ea res***: the change in Bacchis’ conduct.

161 *illa*: the caesura here is the metrical equivalent of the editor’s comma. ***et***: introduces *se*, first in the series of three objects of *cognouit*; cf. *An.* 49–50 *et gnati uitam et consilium meum cognosces et quid facere . . . uelim*. ***se***: how much Pamphilus comes to understand about himself and his own character will emerge as a central issue of the play.

162 *quae domi erat*: the wife is defined by her sphere of activity, recalling the famous epitaph of Claudia, *domum seruauit. lanam fecit* (*CIL* 1² 1211 = 52 no. 17 Courtney).

163 *ad exemplum ambarum*: i.e. from their behaviour. T. welcomes the jingle of *ambarum . . . earum*. Diaeresis after *ambarum* encourages us to take each gen. with its attendant noun.

164 *haec*: the wife. *hic* refers to what is nearer the speaker in time, place, or thought, *ille* to what is more remote. ***liberali***: dat. with *deceat* (*OLD* 4). The alternative, descriptive abl. with (e.g. *mulierem*) *esse* is less likely. *liberalis* ‘respectable’ retains the connotation of its root in *liber*, i.e. ‘worthy of a free person’, though is not restricted to the freeborn; cf. *Eu.* 473 *quam liberali facie!* of the supposed eunuch.

165 *pudens modesta*: the wifely virtues contrast with *maligna* and *procax* at 159. ***incommoda*** ‘troubles’ (e.g. *An.* 627, *Ph.* 248). The mounting moral outrages of Pamphilus’ behaviour culminate with *contumelias*.

166 *omnis*: 59n. ***ferre et tegere***: historical inf. The wife – she gets a name (Philumena) only at 191 – not only endures (*ferre*) Pamphilus’ behaviour but actively seeks to conceal it from others (*tegere*). Contrast the situation in *Epitrepontes*, where the similarly outrageous behaviour of Charisios prompts his father-in-law’s open intervention on behalf of his daughter.

167 hīc ‘thereupon’ (*OLD* 6). Don. compares *V. Aen.* 9.246 *hic annis grauis . . . Aletes*. **uxoris**: obj. gen. **misericordia**: compassion and love are hopelessly entangled in comedy. Thus Simo, upon discovering his son’s infatuation: *hinc illae lacrimae, haec illast misericordia* (*An.* 126).

168 deuinctus . . . uictus: T. is partial to wordplay (paronomasia), though not to the outrageous puns and tongue-twisting locutions so common in Pl. Marouzeau 1951: 216–18 offers a partial list. **huius**: Bacchis. Focus shifts from the *iniuriae* the wife endures to the *iniuriae* Pamphilus does not endure.

169 Bacchidi: a dat. of disadvantage rather than abl. of separation commonly denotes the person deprived, e.g. 514 *eripuit ui uirgini abiens anulum* (*NLS* §61). **huc**: back to the wife. As at 162, the wife is defined by the household.

170 par ingenium: Philotis called Pamphilus’ character *pium ac pudicum* (152), and if true, his wife’s character might well be thought its equal, though Parmeno is perhaps only flattering his young master.

171 in Imbro: an Athenian island NE of Lemnos, strategically placed at the gateway to the Black Sea. Menander’s Ἰμβριοί (*The Men from Imbros*), known from a fragmentary plot summary (Arnott 2000: 626–7), was written in 302/1. The island was in Macedonian hands in the 280s until restored to Athens by Seleucus sometime after 281. It thus remained a subject of interest to Athenians in Apollodorus’ time, but also to the Rome of T. after the Senate again restored it to Athenian control, along with Delos and Lemnos, in 167/6. Its history explains why Pamphilus might have a relative there, why the journey would mean an extended absence from Athens, and why either T. or his model would think to send him in that direction. Comic geography is not entirely fanciful; cf. Aeschinus’ chagrin at being told that his girl might be taken as far as Miletus (*Ad.* 655).

172 horunc: *horum* + *ce*, i.e. Laches and Pamphilus. Parmeno probably gestures toward their house. **ea**: anticipates *hereditas*. **redibat**: fourth conj. verbs most often form the imperf. this way in comedy, though T. also has *seruiebat* (*Ph.* 83) and *ueniebat* (*Ph.* 652). The form predates classical *-iebam* (Meiser 1998: 197, de Melo 2009: 44–6), but in the early second century may still be colloquial rather than archaic. Metrical convenience kept it alive in dactylic verse, e.g. Ennius (*stabilibant*, *Ann.* 42) and Virgil (*uestibant* and *polibant*, *Aen.* 8.160, 436). *redeo* is the technical term for receiving an inheritance (*OLD* 12). Thus Crito, describing a similar situation at *An.* 799, *eius morte ea ad me lege redierunt bona*. **lege**: the reference is sufficiently vague to be thought consistent with either Athenian or Roman practice. A plot turning on a specifically Athenian practice is more explicit about its legal basis, e.g. *Ph.* 125–26 on the law of the *epikleros*.

173 eo: to Imbros. **extrudit**: a very strong verb, ‘to expel’ rather more than merely ‘to send’ and thus consistent with *inuitum*. Laches sounds either

unaware or insensitive to the state of Pamphilus' marriage: he may have thought Pamphilus' love was still for Bacchis.

174 reliquit: subj. is Pamphilus. Some MSS read *relinquit*, but the hist. pres. seems out of place surrounded by narrative perfects. **hic:** adv., contrasting with *rus* below.

175 rus abdidit se: the plot requires Laches' withdrawal to the country. It is left unmotivated here, although we later learn that he spends much time on his farm (215). He will certainly show the stubborn irascibility of comic farmers from Knemon of Menander's *Dyskolos* to Demea of *Ad.* Contrast Menedemus of *Hau.*, whose withdrawal to the country in remorse for having driven away his son leaves his urbane temper largely intact.

176 quid . . . infirmitatis: Parmeno's narrative so far suggests a marriage on the mend. This echo of 101 (*firmae uereor ut sint nuptiae*) recalls the initial problem and thus launches the final stage of the exposition. **adhuc** 'so far' (*OLD* 1d). *huc* above is genuinely spatial.

177 dies complusculos: acc. of duration of time. The dim. of *complures* is colloquial (cf. *pauculis*, 143). The line has no caesura, though Parmeno clearly pauses for effect after the second foot, where scansion reveals diaeresis.

178 bene conuenibat 'there were good relations' (*OLD* 4b). The verb is impersonal. For the form, cf. *redibat*, 172. **inter eas:** between wife and mother-in-law. **interim:** *modo repente*, says Don.

179 odisse: Parmeno introduces as fact the fundamental misunderstanding of the play. He is a seriously untrustworthy narrator, though the audience has no reason yet to know this. His exposition pre-empts other, potentially more accurate explanations of the situation, as noted by Gilula 1979/80: 139–41. The false authority of his account will prove difficult to overcome. **Sostratam:** her mother-in-law, but how do we know this since neither wife nor mother-in-law has yet been named? Sostrata in T. is always the name of a matron (*Hau.*, *Ad.*), and the tradition may identify names with roles. (Sostratos, however, is the romantic lead in Menander's *Dis exapaton* and *Dyskolos*.) T. is adept at slipping names inobtrusively into his exposition: Goldberg 1981/82: 136–37.

180 lites . . . postulatio 'quarrel' and 'protest' respectively, though these are also the technical legal terms for 'suit' and 'complaint'. There is no basis here for any legal action.

182 confabulatum: 77n. Used colloquially, (*con*)*fabulor* suggests merely idle conversation, not specifically storytelling, just as *fabula* had the general sense 'talk' or 'gossip' before it came to mean 'fable' or 'play'. Cf. Titinius, fr. 175 Ribbeck *qui Obsce et Volscce fabulantur, nam Latine nesciunt*, 'who jabber in Oscan and Volscian, because they don't know Latin'. **fugere:** hist. inf. The subject is Philumena.

183 uidere nolle = *ne uideret* says Don., recognizing that in her condition Philumena is anxious less to avoid seeing than to avoid being seen, but neither Parmeno nor the audience as yet appreciates the significance of this fact. Parmeno's language strengthens belief in what only at the end is revealed to be a false representation of Philumena's actions and their cause. **ubi**: temporal, as often in T. (*OLD* 9). Of temporal conjunctions, *ubi* is the most likely to introduce a historic present: *NLS* §217(3). **quit**: a metrically and phonetically convenient alternative to *potest*; cf. *Eu.* 377 *quantum potest* and 844 *quantum queo*.

184 ad matrem . . . ad rem: the former indicates the place (= *ad matris domum*), the latter the reason (cf. *An.* 740, *Ph.* 666 *ad nuptias*, *Ad.* 335 *ad hanc rem*). **abit**: the decisive action. Changes of subject from 177–88 are frequent, unannounced, and yet easy to follow in this narrative, indicative perhaps of the growing split between the two households.

185 illic: at her parents' house. **dies . . . compluris**: acc. of duration of time. **iubet**: here, as often in Latin of all periods, the verb means little more than 'requests' or 'summons' (e.g. *An.* 533, *Hau.* 1047 and White 1993: 266–8).

186 dixere: T. shows some preference for perfects in *-ere*. 'They' = those in the house. **causam . . . nescioquam** 'some excuse or other'.

187 remisit: sc. *causam*. The household seems to waver between flimsy excuse and no excuse at all. Don. takes this as a sign of their *odium*. **accersunt**: the switch from singular to plural (cf. *remisit/simulant*) recalls the syntactic looseness of colloquial speech.

188 aegram: this comes closer to the truth than Parmeno realizes, as will Laches' remark that her *morbus* 'indisposition' owes something to Sostrata's presence in the house (239). T. allows the truth to hide in plain sight. **nostra** 'our mistress'. Such locutions referring to a master or mistress are common. Forms of *dominus/a* are rare in comedy except in generic references to the master-slave relationship. The preferred word is *erus/a* (e.g. 331, 335, 430, 873).

189 uisere: the *vox propria* for paying a call, esp. on an invalid (*OLD* 1c). The inf. to express purpose is the regular construction in early Latin with a verb of motion, e.g. Pl. *Bac.* 631 *uenerat aurum petere* (*NLS* §28, further examples in *SEL* 1:418–19). The infin. remains constant for the 'desiderative' *uisere* (Ernout-Thomas §275), but otherwise, unlike the acc. supine in a similar construction (77n.), it does not establish itself in classical prose. Its return in later poetry (e.g. *Lucr.* 3.896, *V. Aen.* 1.527, *Hor. C.* 1.2.7) may have been contrived as an archaism. **hoc**: the object of *resciuit* is (characteristically) thrust ahead of its clause. Sense encourages strong stops after *eam* and *nemo*, though scansion demands elision in both places. Reconciling semantic and metrical imperatives can be especially problematic in dramatic verse. Don. ad *Eu.* 379 and 530 notes instances where metrical hiatus suggests an appropriate stage action.

190 rescuiit: the verb (*rescisco*, not *rescio* in classical Latin) has the particular connotation of discovering something hidden (Don., Gell. 2.19, who understands the prefix *re* as from *res*, as with *refert*). Its repetition in *Hec.* (208, 262, 285, 287, 473, 519, 567, 790, 867, 868) lends it thematic significance. **ea causa = eius rei causa.** **rure:** in comedy, farms are invariably within easy reach of the city. So, at least, for Menedemus of *Hau.* and Demea of *Ad.*

192 nondum etiam ‘not even yet’. A rare confession of ignorance by Parmeno, though others are destined to follow. What transpired at the meeting will soon be revealed by the principals.

193 nisi ‘except that’ (*OLD* 5a). The clause is loosely tied to the preceding negative idea. **curaest:** sc. *mihi* (pred. dat.). Parmeno may, as Don. says, be *curiosus et garrulus*, but he shows genuine concern for the family to which he belongs.

194 hoc iter: cognate acc., as often with *pergo* (*OLD* 1b). Parmeno’s conclusion recalls his beginning (77).

195 quidem: emphatic, not adversative, since Philotis is also continuing on her way, but the two functions of *quidem* can be difficult to disentangle. So, rightly, Solodow 1978: 94–99. **constitui** ‘to arrange’, a common sense in comedy with an inf. clause (*OLD* 13a). **hospite** ‘a client’, cf. *Eu.* 119 (Thais speaking) *cum illo quocum . . . rem habebam hospite* ‘with him, a client with whom I was having an affair’. Philotis, ever the working girl, has quickly found a replacement for her soldier (85). As Don. notes, her ‘date’ also makes more natural her disappearance from the play.

196 di uortant bene: the ‘optative’ subjunc. No particle is required in this formulaic phrase of leave-taking.

The scene ends with Parmeno and the two courtesans, Philotis and Syra, going their separate ways, the former in the direction of the harbour and so the latter, presumably, in the direction of the forum. The stage is momentarily empty. Renaissance editors of T., working on the Horatian principle that a play requires five acts (*Ars poetica* 189–90), therefore put their first act division here. Continuous performance, however, was the practice on the Roman stage of T.’s day. There were no act breaks. The five-act structure to which Horace refers was a Hellenistic convention that is now well attested in the Menander papyri, but Roman dramatists eliminated those divisions in the process of adaptation. Traces of an original act structure nevertheless remain in Latin texts, and the empty stage at this point may indicate the position of Apollodorus’ first act break. If, however, the Greek *Hekyra* used a delayed prologue by a divinity to reveal the truth of Philumena’s pregnancy to the audience, it would almost certainly have occurred at this point, with the choral interlude marking the end of the first act not coming until after line 280 in T.’s version. That is the arrangement suggested by the position of delayed prologues delivered by divinities in Menander’s *Aspis*,

Heros, *Perikeiromene*, and (probably) *Epitrepontes*, and also Pl. *Cist.* (Humans deliver similarly delayed prologues in *Samia*, *Mil.*, and *Mos.*) For the act divisions of Terence's Greek model, see Lowe 1983: 442–51 and Lefèvre 1999: 148–54, and for the act-structure of Athenian New Comedy more generally, Hunter 1985: 35–42. The empty stages created by Roman dramatists, whatever their origin, create special challenges for performance. Marshall 2006: 176–80 discusses various ways to handle them.

II.i: Laches, Sostrata (198–242)

Pamphilus' father enters from his house, followed immediately by his wife. Whatever Laches learned from Philumena's father has clearly displeased him, and a quarrel begun inside – Laches is already very angry – spills out into the street. Convinced of his wife's responsibility for Philumena's departure and the consequent threat to their son's marriage, he meets her halting protestations of innocence and ignorance with torrents of abuse. Their opening lines, 198–204 and 205, may well be addressed in turn to the audience as each character establishes a stage presence, but Laches, characteristically, quickly intrudes on his wife's appeal for sympathy before it is fully launched. Their quarrel then resumes in earnest.

The scene continues the iambic rhythm of the exposition, but except for brief intervals at 201 and 205–6, T. uses an eight-unit line, the iambic octonarius, that is accompanied by the tibia. The entrance at 198 may therefore have been preceded by a brief cadenza with which the tibicen could set the pitch and the pace of the scene to come. The actors then speak in a recitative fitted to the emotional tension of the moment. At 217, with the tibia still playing, the rhythm switches to trochees as their dialogue moves from tirade to expostulation. See 216n. Such modulations of pace and rhythm are facilitated by the structural similarities of these Latin trochaic and iambic lines, which end with the same cretic cadence. See Introduction 5.4, and Barsby 1999: 301–03, Marshall 2006: 225–30.

198 Pro: this exclamatory interjection is commonly followed by a voc., e.g. *pro Iuppiter* (317), or (as here) by an exclamatory acc. Oaths introduced by *pro* are generally masc. in T. The two exceptions are spoken by distinctly assertive women (Nausistrata, *Ph.* 1008; Pythias, *Eu.* 943). **deum:** already archaic by T.'s day, the gen. pl. in *-um* persists in oaths and certain stock phrases (e.g. *Ad.* 793 *nostrum liberum*) and twice in a prologue by Ambivius Turpio, a speaker highly conscious of his advanced age (*Hau.* 24, 27). Cic. *Or.* 155–6 defends its retention against those who would emend to *-orum* even in old texts. **genus** 'race' (*OLD* 4a), not 'situation' (*OLD* 9), as is clear from the next line, where *mulieres* answers *genus* and *eadem* explains *coniuratio*. *hoc* and *haec* are predicative. Twenty syllables makes this a long octonarius, so that the diaeresis punctuating the oath comes (as often) after the eighth syllable but only the third foot, and the

second half of the line contains two dactyls. The rush of syllables reflects Laches' agitation.

199 utin = *uti* + *n(e)*. This is either the exclamatory adv. with a subjunc. verb, as Pl. *Most.* 172 *contempla ut haec me deceat* 'consider how well this suits me' or (as at 66 above) an indignant question expanding on *coniuratio*, i.e. 'don't all women . . .' **aeque studeant nolintque**: thus Catiline to his recruits at Sal. *Cat.* 20.4 *idem uelle atque idem nolle, ea denu[m] firma amicitia est*, where the alliance in question is what posterity would call a *coniuratio*. *studeant* implies more active involvement than *uellent*.

200 quicquam 'in any way', the adverbial acc. (*NLS* §13 n.2 iv). **ab aliarum ingenio**: Laches judges his wife by a stereotype, just as Bacchis has been judged by Parmeno – and no more accurately, as things turn out. **reperiās**: recalls the opening at 58, which introduced the idea of judging character by type, not as individuals.

201 socrus oderunt nurus: an ambiguity caused here by the similarity of fourth declension case endings may be deliberate, though Laches' intended meaning is clear from what follows. The maxim gains emphasis from the switch to a senarius and, perhaps, a pause in the music (Bruder 1970: 65–6). But is the maxim true? It *sounds* true and, as Don. notes, the play takes its title from this scene and this presumption, but while the *matronae* of comedy are often hard on wayward husbands, e.g. Nausistrata of *Phormio* and Cleostrata of *Casina*, their relationship to daughters-in-law is otherwise unexplored in extant comedy. A terracotta lamp found at Athens, however, shows three (male) mime actors performing a sketch labelled *Hekyra* (ΜΙΜΟΛΟΓΟΙ | ΨΥΠΟΘΗΣΙΣ ΕΙΚΥΡΑ), which hints at some kind of stock situation in mime. See Cicu 1988: 91–3, Bieber 1961: 107, with fig. 415. A *togata* comedy called *Socrus* is attributed to T's successor, Quinctius Atta (d. 77 BCE). Nothing is known of its plot, though Atta is sometimes praised, like T., for his skill in characterization (e.g. Var. ap. Char. *GLK* 1.241). The idea of the problematic *socrus* lives on in folk culture: Stith Thompson's *Motif Index of Folk-Literature* finds room for cruel or treacherous mothers-in-law (motifs S 51 and K 2218.1 respectively), and the putative situation of *Hekyra* – husband goes abroad, leaving wife in his mother's care, with unhappy consequences – appears in later folk narrative, though not documented before the eleventh century. See the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* 12.1 (2005) 440–41, s.v. *Schwiegereltern*. (Bentley, troubled by the syntactic ambiguity and metrical deficiency, avoided these problems by bracketing the line, an extreme remedy to an intriguing interpretive challenge.)

202 uiris: dat. obj. of *aduorsas* and a comparatively rare example of iambic shortening in an oblique case. Behind the generalization lies Laches' suspicion that his wife has undermined the marriage he insisted upon (116). **aeque studiumst**: the echo of *aeque studeant* (199) makes it natural for the impersonal

expression to assume the inf. construction common with *studeo*. **pertinacia:** mere contrariness, thinks Laches, not principle, leads wives to oppose their husbands. The *pertinacia* that matters for the play, however, will be imputed to Pamphilus, not to his mother (496, 591).

203 ludo ‘school’. **doctae ad malitiam** ‘trained for trouble’. Laches’ misogyny has deep roots in comic tradition. No wonder he prefers to live (alone) in the country! **et:** the monosyllable at line end, semantically part of what follows (and often elided), is a favourite Terentian device for merging the natural rhythm of speech with the metrical constraints of dramatic verse; cf. 283, 579, 877. It is far less common in Pl. (Dunkel 1996: 205–8).

204 est: the indic. heightens the humour of the condition. For all Laches knows, there might really be such an institution; cf. the school Gnatho dreams of founding for parasites, *si potis est* (*Eu.* 263–4). **magistram:** Sostrata is no mere pupil. She could be the head. The image developed in these lines, comic in its own right, is difficult to disentangle from the broader comic lexicon of trickery: *ludus* (in all its senses), *doctus*, and *malitia* recall the clever slave, the *magister* of those who carry out his schemes, e.g. Pl. *Ep.* 592, *Ps.* 933, with Fantham 1972: 35–37. Laches fears not just being opposed, but being outsmarted by his wife. **hanc:** the accompanying gesture confirms the identification of Sostrata. This is her cue to speak: she must have followed her husband on stage at 198 to be able to hear his complaint.

205 me miseram: exclamatory acc. Sostrata’s despair immediately gives the lie to her husband’s accusation. She was told Philumena is ill (188): how can this be her fault? **accuser:** the self-effacing passive encourages us to imagine the line as spoken in explanation to the audience. **hem:** more a snort of derision here than a word (‘humph!’). The exclamation is common in T., with a range of meanings from incredulity to sarcasm to threat depending on context: Luck 1964: 15–16, Müller 1997: 121–3. For variations on the overheard aside, see 339n, 671n.

206 non: the negation, echoing *nescis*, is then strengthened by the oath. **mi Lache:** the voc. has an affectionate, earnest connotation. Sostrata, characteristically, meets Laches’ sarcasm with quiet dignity; cf. 232n. The moment of their confrontation receives some small emphasis from the momentary switch to *senarii* in these two lines.

207 itaque: the new start signals a return to *octonarii*. **una . . . liceat:** Sostrata moves from formulaic asseveration to a much more specific hope. She can imagine nothing better than her married life. **mala:** the unexpected turn (παρὰ προσδοκίαν) of Laches’ oath – the prospect of continued life is not often called an evil – is a callous variant on a stock theme of comic misogyny. Cf. the regret of Callicles and Megaronides over the good health of their wives (Pl. *Tri.* 50–65), which ends with acknowledgement of its artificiality (*auffer ridicularia*,

66). T.'s versions of the joke here, at *Hau.* 632–67, and by implication at *Ad.* 42–4, are distinctly bleaker. See Duckworth 1952: 282–85. (Pamphilus meant something a little different when referring to *his* marriage as *malum*, 132.) The oath of avoidance is more conventionally invoked at *An.* 568, *Hau.* 1038, *Ad.* 275.

208 meque: this sentence is closely tied to the previous one. Sostrata either ignores Laches' interjection, or he delivered it aside. **post modo resciscis:** the question of what will and will not be acknowledged provides the play's moral focus; cf. 867–8. Don. identifies Sostrata's claim with the rhetorical figure ἐπαγγελία 'promise', where the speaker limits the damage of an opponent's claim by promising its refutation, a comment that recalls how in subsequent generations T. came to be read rhetorically. See Jakobi 1996: 133–43. **scio:** most editors retain this word for Sostrata in a parenthetic confirmation (= 'I'm sure', *OLD* 6d), as at 350, 756. OCT gives it to Laches, completing his wife's line with an ironic interruption as at 205 and 207. It is in either case paratactic.

209 te inmerito: as before, Laches throws her words back at her. **pro istis factis** 'considering what you've done' (*OLD* 13). Both *istis* and *factis* have negative connotations; cf. *Eu.* 153 *cum istis factis*.

210 quae: rel. pron. A causal relative, i.e. a clause stating the grounds for a previous assertion, commonly signals that function with a subjunc. verb, e.g. *Ad.* 368 *mihi, qui id dedissem consilium, egit gratias* 'He thanked me for having given that advice'. Colloquial Latin, however, may retain the indic., especially when, as here, the antecedent is either 1st or 2nd pers. (*NLS* §157, *SEL* 1:137–8, 292–4). **mē ēt tē ēt:** prosodic hiatus, as a substitute for elision, ensures that the pronouns will receive the necessary emphasis in delivery. Note the similar effect at 214.

211 tum autem 'and what is more'. Combination of *tum* 'furthermore' (*OLD* 9) and emphatic *autem* (*OLD* 3b) is common in T. **adfines** 'in-laws' as distinct from blood relatives (*cognati*). The subj. of the *ut*-clause is postponed to emphasize the wordplay *ex amicis inimici* and the alliteration of *adfines facis*. Laches views the marriage as advantageous for the family, not simply as a way to end the liaison with Bacchis.

212 illum: Pamphilus, from *filio* above. **decreverunt** 'to decide', a common meaning in T. and without official overtones (*OLD* 4b). **dignum:** a rel. clause following *dignus* always takes a subjunc. verb, though it can be hard to decide whether the subjunc. implies purpose or result (*NLS* §158). Another hint that the marriage was advantageous to the family (*honoris genus*, says Don.). **liberos:** Philumena, a generalizing plural for effect as at *An.* 910–11, *Hau.* 299.

213 sola 'single-handed'. **exorere:** 70n. The verb suggests not just a sudden appearance but also interference: Don. takes it closely with *impudentia*. **quae perturbes haec:** purpose clause.

214 mulier: pejorative. Laches puts her in her place. Cf. the famous indignation of Appius Claudius Caecus at Cic. *Cael.* 33 *mulier, quid tibi cum Caelio...*? **omnino lapidem, non hominem:** the metaphor has a long history, for which see Fantham 1972: 57. Examples include Pl. *Mil.* 236 *neque habet plus sapientiae quam lapis* 'He's got no more sense than a stone', *Hau.* 917 *ni essem lapis!* 'If I hadn't been such a blockhead!', even Shak. *Twelfth Night* 1.5.82 'no more brain than a stone'. Don. quotes the original of Apollodorus *σύ με παντάπασιν ἡγήσαι λίθον* 'You think me completely stone' (*PCG*, fr. 9). If *non hominem* is T.'s addition, he may be thinking ahead to the emerging importance of *humanitas* in his play. See 555n.

215 nescire: the acc. subj., easily inferred from *soleo*, is omitted. Such omission, presumably colloquial, is not restricted to comic speech, e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 58, *Clu.* 176, V. *Aen.* 2.25, 433. See de Melo 2007: 149–54. **arbitramini:** the pl. is probably genuine, not merely rhetorical; cf. *uostrarum* below. Laches' quarrel is with all the women of his household.

216 quisque...uostrarum: the gen. pl. of the possessive pron. (cf. *uostrarum nulla*, 240), where classical Latin uses the personal pron., i.e. *quisque uestrum*, in the partitive construction (cf. Weiss 2009: 330, 331). The hyperbaton is consistent with Laches' agitation. Though T. has [*res*] *quaeque* (603) and *quaeque fors* (386), he regularly uses *quisque* for women (e.g. *Eu.* 374, 678). **hic:** in town, as contrasted with *ruri* above.

Laches' diatribe in iambic octonarii ends with this scenarius coda. As he moves from general abuse to more specific complaints, the tempo slows to the less volatile trochaic septenarius, the most common metre for recitative in Roman comedy.

217 multo melius: Laches may be better informed about city doings (*hic*) than country doings (*illic*), but not as well informed as he thinks. His misplaced confidence recalls Demea of *Ad.* 396–9, though the extent of Laches' error is not yet known to the audience. **illic:** 94n.

218 ideo quia 'precisely because', a common expression in Pl. **ut...proinde:** what sounded like a general complaint above (210) now becomes specific as Laches explains the putative damage to his reputation. **fama:** this instrumental abl. is sometimes called the 'abl. of specification' (*SEL* II. 365), as at 601 *quam fortunatus ceteris sum rebus*, 'how fortunate I am in other respects'.

219 iampridem 'some time ago'. The perf. tense of the verb distinguishes this sense (*OLD* s.v. *pridem* 3) from a discovery continuing into the present, 'for a long time now' (*OLD* 4). Contrast Pl. *Poen.* 156 *iam pridem equidem istuc ex te audiui* and *Cas.* 283 *frugi hominem iam pridem esse arbitror*. **tui:** obj. gen. Subject of the inf. is *Philumenam*. Either the gossip reported by Parmeno (179) reached Laches in the country or – if he first heard this explanation from Philumena's father (191) *iampridem* is an exaggeration.

220 adeo: following the negative expression = 'all that much' (*OLD* 4d).

221 adeo ‘to such a degree’ (*OLD* 4b), sc. *cepisse odium*. **odisset domum:** since *odi* has only perfect forms, the tense here is equivalent to an imperf. In saying ‘this whole household’, Laches is really thinking of his own *fama*.

222 quod: the extent of the *odium*. **illa maneret... tu isse:** in the apodosis of a past unreal (contrary-to-fact) condition, the imperf. subjunc. refers to a state still unrealized in the present, the pluperf. to a state unrealized in the past (*NLS* §197). Laches’ certainty is again misplaced: there is no chance that Philumena would still be living in his house under any circumstances. **foras** (adv.) ‘out of the house’, often constructed with a verb of motion (*OLD* 1a). Contrast loc. *foris* (218) ‘outside the house’, i.e. in public (*OLD* 1c). Laches’ coldness toward Sostrata, perhaps to the point of implying divorce (Treggiari 1991: 447 n. 58), contrasts with her eventual offer to withdraw voluntarily to the country (586).

223 at uide ‘consider’ (*OLD* 14c). Laches moves from abuse to self-pity, now casting himself as the injured party (*mi*). Don. aptly compares Simo at *An.* 866–71. The rapid emotional turns of Laches’ speech provide comic variety, but they also recall the complexity of real human responses to real situations. Such recollections of familiar behaviour, however exaggerated in comic guise, enabled Menander (and T. after him) to make the conventions of their genre ‘imitate’ life. **aegritudo:** not ‘illness’ specifically (Laches does not yet know the *morbus*-theory of Philumena’s departure) but ‘anxiety’ generally.

224 habitatum: supine after *abii*. **rei** ‘property’, as *An.* 288 *ad rem tutelam* ‘to look after her property’.

225 sumptus uostros: the extravagance of women, a subject of special interest in 195 BCE, when the senate debated repeal of the *lex Oppia* limiting their expenses (Liv. 34.1), became a lasting topos in comedy; e.g. the complaints of Megadorus at Pl. *Aul.* 165–9, 505–22. See Gruen 1990: 143–45. **ut... posset pati:** a purpose clause in secondary sequence after *abii*. Don. compares the division of responsibility between Micio and Demea at *Ad.* 42–6, a particularly apt comparison since *Hec.* and *Ad.* shared the programme at the funeral games of Aemilius Paulus in 160.

226 praeter aequom atque aetatem: combines the sentiments of *Hau.* 59–60 and *Ad.* 64. The individuals in question there chose to live as they do. Laches is no exception, a point he conveniently forgets.

227 te curasse = curauisse. The exclamatory inf., e.g. *Ph.* 884 *tantam fortunam... esse his datam!* ‘what good luck for them!’, is common in early and colloquial Latin, largely restricted to expressions of annoyance and regret (*SEL* II.423–25, Palmer 1961: 318). Laches’ emphasis leaves the least important word (*rebus*) for last. **aegre:** the adv. with *esse* is another common colloquialism in T., generally in impersonal constructions with *bene*, *male*, *temere*, or *aegre*. See Bagordo 2001: 77–80. Laches’ *nequid... mihi* answers *non te*.

228 operā . . . culpā: *opera*, says Don., implies intention, while *culpa* is the result of ignorance. Cf. the consul Livius' fatuous boast as reported by Cic. *Sen. 11, mea opera, Quinte Fabi, Tarentum recepisti*, where *culpa* would have been more historically accurate. Sostrata's denial avoids fixing blame elsewhere, her bewilderment tacitly refuting Laches' accusation of malice. **immo maxime:** the strong contradiction introduces a new line of argument.

229 sola: with her daughter-in-law. **culpa:** Laches again throws Sostrata's words back at her. The coincidence of metrical and word boundaries in the second half of the line is very striking, as is the alliteration. Laches' angry insistence is palpable.

230 curares: a potential subjunc. in the imperf. expresses what ought to have happened in the past, e.g. *Ph. 297 dotem daretis*, 'you should have given her a dowry'. See *NLS* §121. **curis solui ceteris:** financial concerns. Juxtaposition of *hic/ceteris* conflates the ideas of city/country and family/finances that dominate Laches' thinking. The indicative with causal *quom* is common in early Latin (*SEL* 1.133–5, *NLS* §231).

231 anum: so Micio, disparagingly of the poor widow Sostrata at *Ad. 939 anum decrepitam ducam? matronam* would have been kinder here, but the age disparity is foremost in Laches' mind; cf. 621 below, referring to himself and his wife as *senex atque anus*. The inf. clause is the obj. of *pudet*.

232 illius culpā: neither wants to fix responsibility on Philumena, though Laches is sure that *someone* is at fault. **mi Lache** 'Laches dear'. This endearing vocative, often associated with female speech (Adams 1984: 68–73, Dickey 2002: 220–2, Dutsch 2008: 53–5) comes to characterize Sostrata, e.g. 235, 352, 577, 585, 602, 605, 606. Don. ad *Eu. 95* notes a similar practice there with Thais: such linguistic characterization is well documented in Menander (Sandbach 1970: 121–4, Arnott 1995). In the face of domestic upheaval and personal abuse, Sostrata remains the picture of wifely devotion. Her calmness keeps the emphasis on Laches – for now. *mi* + direct address continues to suggest familiarity in colloquial Latin for generations (cf. Dickey 2002: 214–20, Hall 2009: 67–8, 207–9).

234 peccando: the semantic range extends from simple mistakes to moral offences. Laches probably imagines the full gamut. **detrimenti:** part. gen. (*SEL* 1.19). Sostrata's reputation is already so low that nothing she can do will harm it. Laches is as gratuitously cruel as he is unfair.

235 quī 'how?' The adv. is in origin the instrumental form of the indef. pron. **ea:** answered by *ut* in the next line. **adsimulauerit:** perf. subjunc. in the indirect question after *scio an*.

236 plus (adv.) = *diutius*, a colloquialism (Don.). **unā** 'together' (*OLD* 1a). **signi:** part. gen. with *satis* (*OLD* 1b). *hoc* anticipates the *quod*-clause. Solicitude, not hatred, is uppermost in Sostrata's mind. In projecting her own values on

Philumena, she both confirmed her own good nature and came very close to providing the true explanation for this behaviour, which Laches now dismisses out of hand. The obvious opportunity for irony here is lost by T.'s decision not to reveal the truth of Philumena's condition to the audience. Ultimately, the play's success will depend on the success of that decision.

237 uisentem ad eam 'tried to call on her' (*OLD* 1c). The present part. assumes conative force: the action was attempted but not completed. Cf. *V. Aen.* 2.111 *terrui Auster euntis* 'the south wind stopped them as they departed' and 73n. above. Laches echoes Parmeno's story at 188–9.

238 enim: postpositive in classical Latin, the inceptive *enim* that Quint. 1.5.39 called a solecism is common in comic dialogue when qualifying a previous statement, e.g. *Ph.* 983, *Ad.* 168 (*OLD* 1a, Müller 1997: 71–74). **lassam oppido:** Parmeno had said *aegram* (188). Don. glosses the adv. as *ualde* and derives it from *oppidum*: farmers with abundant harvests say they have enough *et sibi et oppido*. Derivation from *oppidum* is probably correct, though more likely in the sense *'to the ground' > 'utterly' (de Vaan 2008: 431). The adv. was old-fashioned for Quint. (8.3.25) and an archaism for Apuleius. **eo** = *propterea*.

239 tuos . . . mores: word order both emphasizes *tuos* in answer to *sum* and sets up the alliterative phrase *mores morbum mage*. Laches simultaneously excuses his daughter-in-law and blames his wife.

240 adeo 'that's for sure', confirming the preceding statement (*OLD* 6b). **nulla** = *nemo*. Laches returns to his initial theme, the troublesome race of women (198). Don. identifies this structure with the rhetorical figure *ab initio ad finem*. **quin** does the work of *quae non* (68n.). The pronominal origin of the conj. is no longer felt.

241 quae . . . placitast: as often in T., the relative clause precedes its noun (*condicio*), recalling the looseness of conversation, where emphasis takes precedence over logic.

242 duxere: sc. *uxores*. Thus *easdem*. Laches' generalization turns the *gnatus* of 240 into a plural. **impulsu** 'instigation'. The chiasitic repetition emphasizes the point. Laches' rhetoric runs away with him. He will have a different view at 687.

This rather one-sided conversation is now interrupted by an opening door, perhaps accompanied by a brief musical flourish as the tibicen changes the rhythm. Laches and Sostrata stand aside as attention shifts to another quarter.

II.ii: Phidippus, Laches, Sostrata (243–273)

As the third house door opens, Phidippus, Philumena's father, emerges, talking back inside much as Parmeno did at 76. He is readily identified by his address

to his daughter and by the phrases *meum ius* and *patrio animo*. Laches immediately seizes the opportunity to ingratiate himself with his neighbour and to humiliate his wife.

The metre shifts here to iambic septenarii. As a catalectic version of the corresponding octonarius, it has the same number of feet and the same diaeresis after the fourth foot as the trochaic septenarii that ended the previous scene, and the tibicen still plays. A change of mood in the new scene is thus signalled by the gentlest possible change of metre. The transition is seamless and the action continuous: the scene division is a purely editorial convention.

243 Philumenā: a Greek vocative with –ā for –η; cf. *Lache*, 134n. **meum ius:** by returning to her own family, Philumena presumably returned to Phidippus' *patria potestas*, but T. avoids the technical term (and the legal complexities of Roman marriage *cum* and *sine manu*). The 'Philumena' of Apollodorus would similarly have returned to the protection (*kyrieia*) of her father. See, respectively, Treggiari 1991: 459–61 and MacDowell 1978: 86–89. In Menander's *Epitrepontes*, Charisios' father-in-law quickly intervenes to sort out the marital problem, though he is motivated more by reports of Charisios' extravagance with his daughter's dowry than by her personal dilemma. See Traill 2008: 179–88.

244 imperem: a very strong verb; cf. *Eu.* 389 *iubeam? cogo atque impero*. Here it is more wish than reality: Phidippus is not the sort to command anyone, least of all the women of his household – as Laches duly notes (250) and Phidippus himself later admits (270). In comedy, *imperium* used of a father's authority over a child often suggests overreaction, e.g. Demipho's *nec meum imperium . . . reuereri* (*Ph.* 232); Chremes, in a ridiculous situation, laughably complains that his *imperium* was disregarded (*Hau.* 635), while the *lena* Cleareta claims a *matris imperium* (*Pl. As.* 509). Micio famously prefers *amicitia* to *imperium* (*Ad.* 65–7), but the result is problematic. For the wider possible associations of *imperium* and fatherhood, see Leigh 2004: 175–89. **patrio animo** 'fatherly feeling'. The adjective recalls its absence above in the context of *ius*: its avoidance then was not entirely coincidental. Phidippus is more comfortable with sentiment than with power.

245 ut tibi concedam: a deliberately roundabout expression. **lubidini** 'whim'. He puts the gentlest possible construction on Philumena's potentially ruinous refusal to live in her husband's house. These three lines deftly reveal Phidippus' character. For all his verbose posturing (*ego* twice, *ius*, *cogo*, *impero*), the words that matter are *uictus*, *concedam* *neque aduorsabor*. Don. cites Micio here, *non necesse habeo omnia pro meo iure agere* (*Ad.* 51–2), the words of a similarly indulgent, and ultimately deluded, father.

246 eccum = *ecce* + **hum*, old acc. of *hic*. The resulting interjection is inflected for gender and number – *eccam*, *eccos*, *eccas*, and even *ecca* (n. pl.) are used – but not case, e.g. *Ad.* 923 *sed eccum Micio egreditur foras*. Forms of *ecce* generate T.'s

most common formulae for signalling an entrance. See Müller 1997: 117–18, *SEL* II.257–58. **optume** = *opportune*. **hinc**: i.e. *ex hoc* (a reading Don. knew). An adv. of place often stands colloquially for a pron. (e.g. 169). **iam scibo**: this fourth conj. fut., most common with *scio*, is probably formed by analogy with imperf. *scibam* (cf. *redibat*, 172n.). See de Melo 2009: 46–7. The line is addressed to Sostrata, after which Laches turns from her to address his neighbour. She will be little more than a spectator to the conversation that follows. The natural flow of recognition and approach as Phidippus joins the scene is distinct from the stylized delay in acknowledgement discussed at 81n.

247 meis . . . omnibus: sc. *familiaribus*. **adprime** = *vehementissime* (Don.). Not a word in the classical vocabulary. **obsequentem**: Laches has given no evidence of being indulgent toward anyone, but he can be ingratiating when it suits him. The sentence echoes the structure of Phidippus' claim (*etsi ego scio . . . sed non adeo ut ~ etsi scio ego . . . ego tamen faciam ut*) while quietly reversing its values: Laches understands sentiment but maintains power.

248 sed: not the logical sequel to *etsi*, but the word Laches' thought requires. The abrupt grammatical shift (anacoluthon) imposes his manner of expression on his neighbour; *tamen* here would have sounded too conciliatory. **facilitas**: what is *facile* varies with the situation. Don. glosses *indulgentia* here. At *Eu.* 1048 it means 'generosity', at *Ad.* 861 'forbearance'. **corruptat**: a verb of considerable moral force. Cf. Cato's notorious complaint about the Greeks (ap. Plin. *Nat.* 29.14), *quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia corrumpet*.

249 quod: the connective particle, taken closely with *si* (*OLD* 1a). **in rem**: 102n.

250 nunc 'as it is' (*OLD* 10a). **in illarum potestate**: Phidippus' indulgence has led to reversal of the norm. The natural accent on *illarum* and lack of diaeresis after the fourth foot emphasize the key word. **heia**: the interjection (Gk. *εἴα*) is usually deprecatory or noncommittal in T. ('oh, really?'). See Müller 1997: 131–32. Elision after the semantically significant *te* suggests that the interjection is more a sound and a gesture than a word. Phidippus' refusal to respond directly to Laches' unflattering description immediately confirms his *facilitas*.

251 adii: Laches refers to the meeting reported at 190–92. **heri**: this scansion is also found at *Eu.* 169, 357. **itidem**: correlated with *ut*. **amisti**: syncopated form of *amisisti*. As Don. notes, *incertus, inquit, ueni, incertus a te recessi*. The anger directed at Sostrata probably derives from this frustration with Phidippus.

252 adfinitatem: 211n. The pred. adj. (*perpetuam*) is thrust ahead for emphasis. Laches foists his own desire on his neighbour.

253 iras: a poetic pl. also found at 289, 307, 310, 485. Laches means the *cause* of his displeasure. **siquid . . . nobis:** the intransitive verb has only an impersonal passive, which suits Laches' desire to imagine responsibility without quite imagining fault. Cf. Micio's promise at *Ad.* 593 *quod peccatum a nobis ortumst corrigo*.

254 ea: object of *refellendo*. The antecedent is the preceding *si*-clause, treated as a collective noun ('if we've done things wrong . . .'). **uobis** 'your family', dat., probably with *purgando*, though Don. takes it closely with *corrigemus*.

255 te iudice ipso = 'to your satisfaction', abl. of attendant circumstance. **east:** anticipating *quia. causa* is predicative. **retinendi:** sc. *Philumenam*.

256 aegrast: i.e. the *morbus* explanation for Philumena's departure, first raised as a possibility at 188. Laches does not think it likely. **Phidippe:** the vocative at 247 was used to attract Phidippus' attention. Here, as at 263, it is conciliatory.

257 satis: with *diligenter*, thrust ahead of its clause for emphasis. **ut = ut non**, 101n.

259 adeo 'what is more', adding a further argument. **gnati causa:** fatherly feeling is evoked to arouse fatherly feeling, but cf. 115-24, where Parmeno says the marriage was arranged at Laches' instigation for Laches' reasons.

260 illam . . . magni facere: subj. of the infin. is *quem*. Laches learned this, presumably, while insisting on Pamphilus' journey to Imbros (169-73), when his fatherly feeling was much less evident. Some of the better MSS read *magnificare* 'to esteem greatly', a verb found at *Pl. Men.* 371, *St.* 101 but less appropriate to the situation here. The obvious correction to *magni facere* goes back to the mysterious ancient corrector Iovialis. (Modern editors make a similar correction for a similar reason at *Pl. Ps.* 944.)

261 neque clam me est = non me fugi. Cf. *An.* 287 *nec clam te est quam* 'nor are you unaware that . . .' (Bagordo 2001: 134-5). **credam:** pres. subjunc. after *quam*. It would be more direct to say *quam grauius laturus sit*, but Laches is keen to add his own opinion to the statement.

262 si rescierit: Laches' impressive string of hypotheticals (252, 253, 255, 257, 262) reflects his care in handling his neighbour. The verb is fut. perf. indic. in a fut. more vivid construction. Cf. *Hau.* 718 *si hoc pater rescuerit* 'if my father finds this out'. T. uses contracted and uncontracted perfects as metrically convenient. **eo:** 238n. **studeo:** constructed with *ut* at *Hau.* 382, *Ad.* 868. Understand *ut* here as well, with *redeat* supplied from the *priusquam*-clause.

264 animum induco 'I am convinced'; cf. *animum aduortere* 'to pay attention', constructed here with acc. and inf. (*OLD* 12b).

265 hoc ‘in this respect’, sometimes called acc. of the inner object, an essentially adverbial acc. (*SEL* II.202). It anticipates the following clause, the aural equivalent of the editor’s colon. **studeo**: a deliberate echo of 262, with an almost equally rare construction. A complementary inf. is far more common.

266 si facere possim: for the subjunc. after *studeo* (Don. read *possum*), cf. *Hau.* 632 *si tu neges, certo scio*, ‘Even if you deny it, I know very well. . .’, *Ph.* 738 *quod si eum nunc reperire possim, nil est quod uerear*, ‘If only I could find him now, there’s nothing to worry about’ and 473n. The qualification reflects Phidippus’ *facilitas*: Laches senses his weakness and promptly challenges it.

267 eho: more a sound than a word, here introducing an indignant question (*OLD* 1b, Muller 1997: 105–06). **num quid nam**: expecting a negative reply (often written as one word). **uirum** ‘her husband’. He does not pursue the *morbus* explanation.

268 ui . . . cogere: by what parental authority he might muster, which he promptly acknowledges is not much (270). **sancte adiurat**: possibly an ironic echo of 60–1.

269 non posse: impers. and so lacks an acc. subj. The subject of *perdurare* is *se*.

270 uiti: 97n. **animo leni**: descriptive abl.

271 em Sostrata: 63n. Having established that husband loves wife and that wife will not remain in husband’s absence, Laches almost triumphantly deduces that the fault must be Sostrata’s. Having scored this point off his wife, he promptly turns back to Phidippus. **heu**: 74n.

272 istuc: the decision to remain in her parents’ house. **quidem**: the qualification recalls the hope that Pamphilus’ return may resolve the crisis. **num quid uis**: a polite expression of conversational disengagement and a standard exit formula in comedy. See Hough 1945. Here it is not without a touch of impatience, as at *Hor. S.* 1.9.6 *cum adsectaretur, ‘num quid uis?’ occupo*. Phidippus left his house for a reason, and Laches has been detaining him.

273 est quod ‘there is a reason why’ (*OLD* 7b). A following ind. quest. is normally subjunc., but early Latin occasionally retains the indic., usually in what seem to be questions of fact, though as late as the fourth century CE the grammarian Diomedes heard the indic. as colloquial and called the subjunc. in this construction *eruditius* (*GLK* 1.395.15). Explanations of the modal shift vary, in part for lack of agreement on a corpus of examples: definitions can be subjective, ‘correction’ by ancient editors may distort the record, and variations for metrical convenience by nature defy linguistic explanation; cf. Bräunlich 1920: 169–73, *NLS* §179, Stephens 1985, Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 171–2. **eo**: the verb. Laches, characteristically, does not ask permission. Their joint exit is another sign of his dominance.

II.iii: Sostrata (274–280)

Barely able to get a word in edgewise with the men present, Sostrata now finds herself alone and can speak freely. Like her husband, she tends to think in stereotypes (274–5, 277–8), but she confirms the truth of what she told Laches. The passage is an example of what critics call a ‘link monologue’, a brief speech that covers a dramatically significant interval and, very often, provides an actor with time to change roles. So here, Sostrata’s address covers the time from Phidippus’ exit to the forum at 273 to the same actor’s return from the opposite wing as Parmeno at 281. The terminology goes back to Prescott 1939, popularized by Duckworth 1952: 105–9. (For some Menandrian examples, see Blundell 1980: 25–7.) This traditional approach to the monologue’s function, however, exaggerates the technical challenge of rapid role changes, for which see Marshall 2006: 108–12, and its emphasis on structural considerations distracts from equally important questions of characterization and of the rapport monologues can cultivate (or deny) between a character and the audience.

Here, for example, it matters a good deal to the dramatic effect, and thus possibly to the play’s success, whether Sostrata addresses this speech directly to the audience, reaching out for their sympathy, or is simply being overheard while thinking aloud. The former strategy implicates the spectators directly in the play’s action and makes them party to her dilemma, while the latter keeps them at a distance. Don. imagined this latter conception (*secum loquens anus*), but this is not necessarily the better, or even the historical choice. Characters in Greek comedy sometimes converse directly with the audience, a device often though not always signalled by an exclamatory *ἄνδρες* in the text, and reaching out to the audience this way can be crucial to the dramatic effect, as when Demeas and his son Moschion set out their alternative perspectives in the monologues of Menander’s *Samia*. Though T. does not signal his intentions with explicit textual clues, the physical intimacy of the early Roman stage, its longstanding practice of dramatic asides, and its overt cultivation of audiences through prologues (a convention that T.’s otherwise unusual prologues carefully maintain) make the establishment of some emotional contact between actor and audience easy to imagine. Each production must choose for itself how to stage the scene. The monologues of *Hecyra* will in any case reveal their especially important function. They centre more than most on the inner thoughts and feelings of the play’s characters, especially its women, whose values and motives tend otherwise to be either challenged or ignored by their men. Thus even the narrative monologue of Bacchis at 816–40, a turning point in the action, will reveal as much about character as about plot. See Bain 1977: 190–4, Denzler 1968: 134–43, and on the general issue of creating rapport with the audience through monologues and asides, Slater 1985: 155–60, Moore 1998: 33–49.

The tibicen continues playing, but the rhythm now shifts from the iambic to the trochaic septenarius for the duration of the scene.

274 ne: an affirmative particle (Gk. νή), almost always followed by a pers. pron. **aeque** ‘equally’, taken with *inuisae*. The mild hyperbaton creates the deliberate wordplay with *inique*. **uiris:** dat.

275 quae: subject of *faciunt*. *Omnes* and *dignae* provide subj. and pred. adj. for the following *ut*-clause.

276 quod ‘as to the fact that’, an adverbial conjunction (*OLD* 8a, *NLS* §241).

277 expurgatu: supine (*NLS* §153). The form is in origin probably a fourth declension dat., like *neglectu* (*Hau.* 357), *uestitu* (*Ad.* 63). See Weiss 2009: 251, 445. **animum induxerunt:** 264n. The plural subject recalls the *uiri* of 274. Sostrata acknowledges the stereotype of 201 while adding her own generalized view of husbands. Here and at 278, line ends count for little: the significant pauses are internal. The disrupted metrical cadence reflects the emotion behind her declaration.

279 habui ‘treated’; cf. *Ad.* 48 *habui, amaui pro meo* ‘I treated him – loved him – as my own son’. **ac si** ‘as if’ (*OLD* s.v. *atque* 14). **gnata:** 124n. **qui:** 103n. **eueniat:** a genuine present. Sostrata’s ordeal is ongoing: it only *began* with Philumena’s departure.

280 nisi: 193n. **filium:** properly the subject of *redeat* but displaced to the main clause for emphasis, a mannerism called prolepsis, e.g. *Eu.* 657–58 *ego illum nescio qui fuerit* ‘I don’t know who he was’. It is colloquial, or at least meant to suggest the informality of colloquial speech (*SEL* II.222–4, Hofmann 1951: 113–14; cf. Slings 1992: 105–8. Greek examples in Cooper 1998: 985–90). Roman dramatists may have learned to suggest conversational spontaneity this way from their Greek predecessors, but the figure itself is not necessarily a Grecism. Spoken Latin, too, may have created emphasis this way. **multimodis** = *uehementer* (*Don.*).

Sostrata was driven outside by her argumentative husband. Now that he is gone, she retreats to the sanctuary of her house. Her exit line provides the cue for Pamphilus’ appearance. She is about to get her wish, though it will not bring quite the anticipated result.

III.i: Pamphilus, Parmeno (Myrrina) (281–335)

Entrances to this point have all been from within one of the houses as the consequences of Philumena’s mysterious departure spill out into the street. Each succeeding scene expanded and personalized Parmeno’s initial account of the crisis to Philotis and Syra. They were all thus essentially expository, adding cogency to the view that the empty stage after Sostrata’s departure at 280 ended the first act of T.’s model. Pamphilus’ long-awaited return from Imbros now is a new development, promising the first significant advance in the plot. He will be immediately recognizable by his travelling costume (wide-brimmed hat and

cloak), by the restatement of his dilemma, and by the fact of Parmeno – last seen leaving for the harbour to find him – in tow. The two of them enter in the middle of their conversation as Pamphilus reveals the extent of his agitation over the apparent estrangement of his mother and his wife.

The scene continues the trochaic rhythm of Sostrata's monologue, with the lines varying between octonarii and septenarii until 293, when the metre shifts to iambics. The tibicen, who began playing at 198, will get no rest until 327.

281 Nemini . . . homini: although, strictly speaking, a noun derived from *ne* + *homo* (cf. *nequis*), *nemo* can join with a noun to become the equivalent of *nullus*, e.g. *Eu.* 549, *Ph.* 591, *Ad.* 259 (*OLD* 5a). **acerba:** neut. pl. as substantive. He spells out these tribulations at 294–8. **oblata:** Pamphilus readily casts himself as a victim of circumstance. The truth, or lack of truth, in that characterization is central to the play, though this is not yet clear to the audience.

282 hancin: 7on. **parsi:** 1st pers. perf. of *parco* + inf. 'to refrain from' (*OLD* 2c). The form is unique in T. (*pepercit* at *Ad.* 562), but perfs. built on this stem are common in Pl. and probably colloquial, e.g. *Cato orat.* 122M, *Nep. Thr.* 1.5, *Petr.* 58.5. Pamphilus alludes to the suicide commonly threatened by those unhappy in love, e.g. *Ph.* 551–2, *Pl. Merc.* 471–3, *Ps.* 85–90. The lover's complaint in this opening speech is quite conventional, although his actual dilemma is not; cf. the examples in Duckworth 1952: 238–39.

283 tanto opere: a lover's exaggeration. Pamphilus is no Odysseus, unless the errand to Imbros proved unexpectedly difficult. His labours are largely in his mind. **hui:** an exclamation of strong emotion, though the emotion is more commonly generated by scepticism (*An.* 474) or surprise (*Hau.* 606, also at line end). See Müller 1997: 130–1. Here it is a modern emendation, but *cui* of the MSS, often written as part of the following line, gives weak sense.

284 fuerat praestabilis 'it would have been preferable'. Because the idea of (unfulfilled) possibility is felt to be present in the adj., Latin can use the indic. where English feels the need for a subjunc.; cf. *An.* 187, *Hau.* 335, *Ph.* 956. **ubiuis gentium** 'anywhere in the world'. The gen. is partitive, as *usquam gentium* (293), *nusquam gentium* (*Ad.* 540), *quoquo terrarum* (*Ph.* 551).

285 haec: the situation at home; obj. of *resciscere*. Pamphilus repeats himself in his despair, since *huc* ~ *domum* and *haec* ~ *hac causa* of 283. Having discovered trouble at home, he wishes he were somewhere else, a characteristic response.

286 labos 'trouble', as at *An.* 720, *Hau.* 82. This is the normal spelling in comedy, though Pl. has *labor* at *Cur.* 219, *Rud.* 202.

287 rescitumst echoes *resciscere* (285). Pamphilus' thoughts are closely linked throughout. **lucrost:** the pred. dat. ought properly to follow a dat. of the person affected (i.e. *nobis omnibus*). The shift in construction (anacoluthon) is a

sign of agitation and is T.'s innovation here. Don. cites the original, a carefully balanced *sententia*: οἱ γὰρ ἀτυχοῦντες τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνομεν | ὅσον ἂν ποτ' ἀγνοῶμεν ἡτυχηκότες 'we who are unfortunate count as profit all the time we do not know we are unfortunate' (*PCG*, fr. 10).

288 sic: by the fact of his return. **qui** = *quomodo* (103n.). The interrog. adv. introduces the clause dependent on *reperias*. **reperias:** another potential subjunc., but unlike 58 and 200, the 2nd pers. subject is specific. The verb will recur at 662 and 843, becoming a key word in a play about concealment and discovery.

289 haec = *hae* (101n.). **irae:** 253n.

290 ambas: Sostrata and Philumena. Parmeno takes no side since he does not yet know where his master's sympathies lie. **reueriturus** 'will have regard for' (*pace OLD* 1b). The verb in T. otherwise connotes fear (630, *Ph.* 233). The thought echoes Sostrata's hope at 280.

291 restitues: sc. *ambas*. The tricolon is noteworthy for its parallelism, alliteration, and gentle weighting toward its culminating member. This suggestion of prompt, decisive action stands in implicit contrast to the largely passive young man we have so far seen and heard (of).

292 leuia . . . pergrauia: the contrast is not between serious matters and trifles but between burdens easy to remove and difficult to remove. *Non dicit*, says Don., *non esse causam sollicitudinis, sed leuem dicit*. The intensive *per-* implies some exaggeration on Pamphilus' part, but not invention. **in animum induxti** 'you have made up your mind that' (*OLD* 13c). Syncopated perf. like *amisti* (251).

Parmeno has countered Pamphilus' despair with a call to action. His alternation of octonarii and septenarii suggests some specific musical relationship to the similar alternation in Pamphilus' opening outburst, e.g. by transposition or inversion of the melody. How this responsion was realized is beyond recall, but the partnership attested between dramatist and musician in the Roman theatre suggests a range of possibilities. See Cic. *de Orat.* 3.102, Don. *Ad com.* 8.9, p. 30 Wessner, with Moore 2008: 21–5. As their conversation now moves from generalities to specifics, the rhythm shifts to iambic octonarii to signal the change in tone.

293 consolare: 2 pers. sing. (213n.). **miser:** 133n. The word recurs with similar emphasis at the end of 296 and 300. As a comic *adulescens*, Pamphilus revels in his love-induced wretchedness. His conventional stance tempers the ostensibly tragic quality of his lament, while Parmeno's quite practical advice implies a weakness more of will than of means on his master's part.

294 uxorem: predicative. **habebam . . . deditum:** *habeo* + pf. participle will eventually provide the perfect of late Latin and its descendants, but here the verb still means 'keep' (*OLD* 27) and the participle is predicative with *animum*.

cf. 582, 752, *Eu.* 386 (*NLS* §100 n. ii). **alibi**: with Bacchis, but Pamphilus is not comfortable saying so, either from delicacy or shame. His version of events largely confirms Parmeno's account, 114–74. Yet a third version will come from Laches, 675–88.

296 iam 'by this time' (*OLD* 3a). **ut**: concessive, the only clear example in T., who prefers to introduce concessive clauses with *etsi* or *quamquam*; cf. 378n. **quoivis**: indef. pron.; cf. *Ad.* 862 *quoivis facilest noscere* 'it is easy for anyone to recognize'. **scitust**: supine (277n.). Pamphilus is not the only unhappy person *in hac re*, but he is the only person he is thinking about.

297 illim = *illinc* 'from that place', corresponding to *alibi* (294). This older form of the adv. (*ille* + *-im*) is frequent in comedy. **in ea**: Bacchis.

298 huc: the adv. of place refers both to his house and his wife. **con-tuleram**: sc. *animum*. **em**: 63n. **porro** 'in turn' (*OLD* 4). **ab hac**: from his wife. The phrase is rushed ahead of its clause. **quae . . . abstrahat**: a final clause, where *quae* = *res*, i.e. the trouble between mother and wife.

299 tum 'what's more' (*OLD* 9). **ex ea re**: the crisis caused by Philumena's departure. Pamphilus cannot or dare not contemplate any more specific word for the problem he confronts than the colourless *res* (296, 298). **me**: intended as the acc. subj. of *inuenturum*, Pamphilus' wording creates an ambiguity that hints at the truth of who may actually be *in culpa*. The various ways to understand his statement accurately reflect the uncertainties of the situation it describes.

300 quod: the connective particle, 'as to which' (*OLD* 1). **quom . . . inuenero**: fut. perf. indic. in a temporal clause, the regular mood in early Latin, e.g. *Hau.* 557, 726–7 (*NLS* §231). **porro** 'hereafter' (*OLD* 2). Pamphilus can imagine no way to take Parmeno's advice without fixing blame on one of the women in his life. His thinking is as absolute as his father's was at 209–13.

301 matris . . . inurias: having just said that either his mother or wife must be at fault (299), Pamphilus promptly ascribes the blame to Sostrata, much as Laches did. The presumption is so patently unfair, it is tempting to read *matris* as obj. gen. with *pietas*, but the hyperbaton is improbable and the sense would be redundant. **pietas**: the obligation of child to parent (*OLD* 3a) will become Pamphilus' preferred rationale for his subsequent behaviour (447, 481, cf. 584). The moral cliché was so common that Pl.'s Calidorus can joke about the need to swindle his mother as well as his father *pietatis caussa* (*Ps.* 120–2). The reversal was familiar in comedy, says Don. (ad *Ad.* 521): T.'s more serious invocation of the theme sets him apart from his colleagues in the tradition. See the material assembled by Segal 1987: 15–21, and the discussion of Wright 1974: 137–8.

302 tum: 299n. **ita**: the conduct described by Parmeno, 164–6.

303 quae: fem. sing., referring to the subj. of *pertulit*. As so often, T. thrusts the obj. of the clause (*inurias*) ahead of its ostensible beginning (*quae*). **numquam . . . patefecit:** Parmeno presumably observed for himself Pamphilus' continuing affair with Bacchis, which he then reported to Philotis on his own authority. That Philumena's mother, Myrrina, knows something of her daughter's earlier forbearance is implied at 389 and 393, but she may not know the full truth even then. **loco:** not 'place' but 'circumstance' (*OLD* 21). Cf. *Hau.* 537–8 *laudas qui eros fallunt?* :: *in loco ego uero laudo*, 'Do you praise those who fool their masters?' :: 'In the right circumstances I do.' As a young wife, Philumena would not have had many opportunities to go out.

305 unde = ex quo. **quae . . . permansit:** the indic. in a causal clause (cf. 303) may imply a fact, not an opinion on the part of the speaker (*NLS* §159, *SEL* 1.292–4), though T.'s choice of mood is not consistent.

306 haud quidem hercle: Parmeno addresses Pamphilus' final remark. He will not be drawn into a discussion of *pietas*. Intensive *quidem* (Gk. γέ) and *hercle* are often paired, the former here emphasizing the particle and the latter justifying that emphasis, e.g. *An.* 225, *Hau.* 523, *Ph.* 164. **paruom:** responds to *magnum nescioquid* and recalls 292. **ueram rationem** 'the true explanation' (*OLD* 5a). The alliteration and wordplay of the line are traditional in the diction of comic slaves.

307 quae . . . irae: the clause provides the subj. of *faciunt*. Word order emphasizes the play of *maxumas/maxumae* and *irae/iniurias*. Artful construction turns a generalization into a maxim, as at 199 (*omnes . . . omnia*). **interdum** 'sometimes'. A prophetic qualification, given the imminent discovery.

308–9 One line answers the other: *quibus in rebus ~ de eadem causa, alius ~ iracundus, est ~ est factus*. The correspondence encourages understanding *est factus* as a gnomic, rather than true perf., as *Ad.* 855 *numquam ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad uitam fuit quin . . .* 'Nobody ever has his life so under control that . . . '.

309 quom '[in circumstances] when' (*OLD* 4). The second *alius* expected here is suppressed. Parmeno's pedantic moralizing creates a somewhat convoluted syntax.

310 pueri 'children', a common sense in the pl., without presuming their sex (*OLD* 4); cf. *puero* 'child' at 668. **pro leuibus noxiis:** Parmeno's example echoes his claim at 292. **iras gerunt** 'bear grudges' (*OLD* 5 s.v. *gero*).

311 eum: sc. *animus*, explained by the preceding rel. clause. Subj. of *gerunt* is *pueri*.

312 leui 'insubstantial', i.e. both of little importance and easily changed. Abl. of description.

313 fortasse: constructed with acc. + inf., as Pl. *As.* 37, *Epid.* 296, *Merc.* 782. The MSS of T. all preserve a verb conjugated in the 3rd pers. sing., though not all read the same verb: Don. preserves the inf. reading. **unum aliquod** 'one of some kind'. The single septenarius here marks the end of Parmeno's speech, a fairly common form of metrical punctuation in T. (Bruder 1970: 69).

314 nuntia: thus Amphitruo sends Sosia ahead to announce his imminent arrival (Pl. *Am.* 195). The homecomings of Greek New Comedy (e.g. Men. *Sam.* 96–112) become elaborate stock scenes on the Roman stage, where returning travellers are routinely welcomed with prayers of thanksgiving and a banquet. T. returns to something closer to the restraint of his Greek models. See Knapp 1907: 300–2, Wright 1974: 141–50, and below 359n.

Parmeno turns to carry out his master's order, but which house does he approach? Sostrata clearly awaits news of her son (280), and her house is his house. What Philumena might expect is less clear, as is Pamphilus' licence to approach his in-laws at this moment of estrangement. Nothing in the preceding dialogue specifies the intended stage action, but the question is pre-empted by unexpected sounds of turmoil within Phidippus' house (*hem!*). Master and slave then naturally turn in that direction.

315 trepidari... cursari: the impers. pass. keeps the statement vague. An act. infin. would require a specific acc. subj. The verbs may distinguish between the sounds of voices and feet (Don.). **russum prorsum** 'back and forth' (*OLD* 1c s.v. *russum*), a set expression like *sursum deorsum* and ὄνω κάτω. **agedum:** *age* (exhortation) + *-dum* (intensive suffix, as in *nondum*, *uixdum*, etc.), 'come on, then!' See Müller 1997: 113–15. The particle softens the imper., which might otherwise be thought inappropriate for a slave addressing his master.

316 accedo propius: a stage direction to himself. Parmeno and Pamphilus approach and make a show of putting their ears to the door. **em:** 63n. Parmeno hears more noise. **fabularier:** 104n. (form), 182n. (sense).

317 pro Iuppiter: 198n. Pamphilus jumps back in surprise on hearing new sounds behind the door. Attributing the exclamation to Philumena offstage, e.g. Victor 2007b: 121–2, misunderstands the action, not to mention the male oath by Jupiter (198n.). **tute:** *tu* + *te*. The intensifier (like *-met* and *-pse*) makes the emphatic pron. even stronger: the equivalent. pl. would be *uosmet*. **uetas:** sc. *loqui*.

318 Philumena's mother (Myrrina) is heard within. T. plays with a familiar comic convention, which marks an offstage birth with the new mother's cries in labour heard from inside the house, e.g. *An.* 473 *Iuno Lucina, fer opem, serua me, obsecro*. Cf. *Ad.* 486–8, Pl. *Aul.* 691–2. Here it is the older woman's voice crying out not to cry out. T. perhaps teases his audience with this allusion, pitting their knowledge of the convention against his characters' ignorance of the situation. See Gilula 1979/80: 145 n. 15.

319 nullus sum: along with *perii* and *interii* (322), a stock expression of comic despair. Pamphilus' conventional language again contrasts with the generic oddity of his position. Ignorance, not love, seems to be his undoing. **quidum** = *qui* ('how?') + *-dum* (315n.).

320 celant: constructed with acc. obj. and acc. of the person from whom the obj. is concealed, a colloquial usage (*OLD* 5a, *NLS* §16.iii). **uxorem:** sc. *tuam*.

321 paitare nescioquid 'trembling with some kind of fever'. *paueo* + the iterative suffix *-ito* suggests both internal fear and physical trembling. Servius quotes this line ad *Aen.* 1.92 *soluuntur frigore membra*, noting *et timor pro frigore et frigus pro timore ponitur*, while Don. (Serv.'s likely source) makes explicit the association with disease here: *aegrotare, quasi horruisse et palpitare uenis*. Thus Pamphilus' question at 323. The acc. of the internal obj. specifies the content of the idea latent in the verb (*NLS* §13 ii). Parmeno is deliberately vague about both the fact and its source. **si forte est:** colloquial *si*, where formal Latin uses *num* to introduce an ind. quest., is common in T., as is the indic. instead of the subjunc. (273n.). Parmeno suggests no more than a possibility. Cf. *Ph.* 775 *nescio. uerum, si forte, dico*. 'I don't know. I'm saying it's possible.'

322 poteram: sc. *dicere*. **una** 'all at once' (adv.). At 188 Parmeno treated illness as a mere excuse for Philumena's behaviour. He has edited the information passed on to his master and now covers up that fact. Doubts about the sureness of his knowledge grow as *nescio* becomes his answer to everything.

323 morbi: 97n. **nemon** = *nemo* + *ne*.

324 cesso + inf. is a comic formula for shrugging off hesitation, e.g. *Pl. As.* 125 *sed quid ego cesso ire ad forum?*, *T. An.* 845 *cesso adloqui?*, *Hau.* 410 *cesso pultare ostium uicini?* It is more exclamation than question, so neither interrog. adv. nor subjunc. verb is required. See Morris 1890: 33–4. **certo sciam** 'I know for a fact' (i.e. *certum est quod scio*) as distinct from *certe sciam* 'I know for sure' (i.e. *certum est me scire*). *certo* is used only with *scire*, *certe* with a variety of verbs.

325–6 Pamphilus is in a hurry, but not such a hurry that he cannot first apostrophize his wife for two lines before he goes. Don. aptly cites *Ph.* 201–2 (also modelled on a play by Apollodorus) *quodsi eo meae fortunae redeunt, Phanium, abs te ut distrahar, | nullast mihi uita expetenda*, 'If my fate demands that I be torn from you, Phania, my life will no longer be worth living.'

325 quonam modo: modifies *adfectam*. **Philumenā:** 243n. **offendam** 'find' (*OLD* 3b).

326 periculum: the contraction is the regular form of *periculum* in comedy and a common convenience in later poetry. Pamphilus envisions her at death's door, as *una* soon makes clear, but he is reluctant to articulate the thought. **perisse:**

perf. with pres. sense, as often with verbs like *pereo*, *memini*, *occido*, etc. For the conventional sentiment, see 282n. **haud dubiumst**: Pl. and T. regularly express doubt either with *quin* or with acc. + infin., e.g. *Ad.* 976 *haud dubiumst quin emitti aequom siet*, Pl. *Poen.* 183 *quid tu dubitas quin extempulo . . . fur leno siet?*, but *Ps.* 1313 *quid ergo dubitas dare mihi argentum?* The latter construction is colloquial, as Cic. *Fam.* 16.21.2 (the younger Marcus to Tiro) *gratos tibi optatosque esse . . . non dubito*.

Pamphilus now rushes into the house of Phidippus. Parmeno, busybody though he is (cf. his frustration at 317), stays behind and briefly explains why. The shift in mood from high, if somewhat artificial emotion to practical explanation is marked by the sudden silence of the tibicen as Parmeno turns to address the audience in iambic senarii, the first spoken verse since 197.

327 non usu' factost: *usus est* = *opus est* and takes the same construction; cf. *Hau.* 80 *tibi ut opu' factost face* ('do what you have to do') and 104n. **nunc**: this would in fact be a terrible moment, dramatically speaking, for Parmeno to follow his master (and discover what Pamphilus is about to discover), but he does not yet know this.

329 heri: Parmeno alludes, somewhat imprecisely, to the events narrated at 185–94, a reminder of how compressed the play's action is.

330 morbus: he no longer seems to doubt that Philumena is ill, though he does not give up entirely on the idea of *odium* between the two families. **amplior**: more serious. **factus siet**: the potential subjunc. (145n. for the form) will be followed by the fut. indic. (*dicent*, *commiscentur*) in apparent violation of the rule that both protasis and apodosis of an ideal condition are subjunc. (*NLS* §192). Parmeno's agitation may be addling his syntax, but the way he sees the situation, this hypothetical event would have a certain consequence.

331 nolim: potential subjunc., which 'differs from the indic. only in being milder and more deprecating' (*NLS* §119). **maxume**: the following emphasis on himself suggests a largely *pro forma* concern for his master. **eri**: 188n.

332 ilico: 159n. **Sostratae**: gen. with *seruom*. Identifying himself this way emphasizes the *odium* he attributes to Phidippus' family.

333 tulisse: subj. is *seruom*. **commiscentur**: here nearly synonymous with *dicent* but with overtones of tale-telling. It is a common word in Pl. for a clever slave's fabrication, e.g. *Ps.* 1206 *ut docte dolum commentust!* 'How cleverly he contrives his trick!' Lines 332 and 333 are almost perfectly symmetrical, as befits the sequential pattern of Parmeno's thought.

334 capiti atque aetati 'health and well-being'. The two words are nearly synonymous. **illorum**: of the entire family. **qui**: neut. abl. pron. Its antecedent is *aliquid mali*.

335 in crimen ueniet ‘get the blame’ (*OLD* 3a). A legal action is not necessarily implied, though Don. understands the line this way. **in magnum malum:** a standard euphemism by slaves who see their punishment coming, usually in the form of a beating (e.g. *An.* 179, 431, *Ph.* 851, *Eu.* 714, 968, 997). Cf. the famous threat of the Metelli to the dramatist Naevius, *malum dabunt Metelli Naevio poetae*, deliberately couched in stage language (Goldberg 1995: 34–5).

Parmeno has from his very first line (76) affected the speech and manner of the *seruus callidus*, though we have just seen his self-importance dissolve in a confession of ignorance (320–3). This ‘link monologue’ provides an opportunity to regain some of his lost stature by burnishing his rapport with the audience, but how successful he is at claiming his proper role remains to be seen.

III.ii: *Sostrata, Parmeno, Pamphilus* (336–60)

The noise from within Phidippus’ house that interrupted Pamphilus and Parmeno at 314–16 was also heard by Sostrata, who now hurries out to discover its cause. Her first thought, significantly, will be for Philumena’s well being. That concern, and its contrast with Parmeno’s coldly practical advice, further reveals her kind nature, while their dialogue also fills the time required between Pamphilus’ exit into Phidippus’ house at 326 and his return, shaken by what he has seen inside, at 352. For the question of address – to herself or to the audience? – see note to II.iii.

The shift in mood is signalled by the return of music as Parmeno’s spoken monologue gives way to dialogue performed in the recitative of iambic septenarii.

336 Nescioquid: adv. ‘to some degree’ (*OLD* 7e). **iamdudum** ‘for some time now’, *iam* + *-*dū* (cf. Gk. *δῆν* ‘for a long while’) + intensive suffix -*dum* (*OLD* s.v. *dudum* 1b, de Vaan 2008: 181). The adv. often combines in drama with a pres. verb to indicate an action begun in the past and continuing into the present, e.g. *Eu.* 743 *iamdudum hic adsum* ‘I’ve been here for some time’. *iam diu* and *iam pridem* are also common; *modo* is used this way at 458 below (*SEL* 1.17–18). **hic:** adv., referring to Phidippus’ house. **tumultuari:** 315n. **misera:** 87n. The adj., in apposition to the subj. of *audio* (‘poor me’), amounts to little more than a vague expression of distress, as at 285 *miserum me resciscere* ‘I discovered to my dismay’.

337 male = *ualde*, a common substitution with ominous verbs like *metuo* and *timeo* (*OLD* 10a). **Philumena:** expressions like Pl. *Per.* 314 (of a boil) *quando istaec innatast tibi?* ‘When did you get that?’ and *Mil.* 271 *illic est Philocomasio custos* ‘There’s Philocomasium’s guardian’ suggest this is dat., but the difference here between possessive dat. and gen. is minimal (*NLS* §63). Contrast *Bac.* 728 *cape stilum propere et tabellas tu has tibi*, where Pistoclerus has brought the writing implements and Mnesilochus is now asked to take them up: *tuas tabellas* would not suit the context, since the *tabellae* are not yet *his*.

338 quod: the neut. pron. came to be used adverbially to mean, as here, ‘with reference to which’ and sometimes then ‘because’ (*NLS* §241). The reference is to the preceding statement. **Aesculapi . . . Salus:** in Greek tradition Hygeia, personified Good Health, was sometimes represented as the daughter of the healing god Asclepius (e.g. Paus. 1.23.4), whose shrine at Epidaurus was so famous that Pl. could refer to it with minimal explanation at *Cur.* 216. Both divinities had well-known temples at Rome. That of Aesculapius on the Tiber island was dedicated in response to a plague of 293, its location settled by the behaviour of a giant serpent brought from Epidaurus (V. Max. 1.82, Liv. 10.47.6–7). The temple of Salus on the Quirinal, dedicated in 302, was famous for its paintings by the original Fabius Pictor (Liv. 9.43.25, 10.1.9; Plin. *Nat.* 35.19). The two divinities are associated by Vitruvius 1.2.7; cf. *CIL* 8.17726 (*Aesculapem et Hygiam*). **huius:** part. gen. with *nequid* (*NLS* §77 ii).

339 uisam: 189n. **heus:** the interjection is often used to call someone back, e.g. Pl. *Ep.* 1 *Heus, adulescens!* :: *quis properantem me reprehendit pallio?*, whether among equals, inferiors, or superiors, though women use it only when addressing social inferiors (Pl. *Cas.* 165, *Rud.* 413, T. *Eu.* 594). See Hofmann 1951: 15–16, Müller 1997: 102–5. Its conversational tone makes it rare in other genres: thus the striking effects at V. *Aen.* 1.321, 7.116. **hēm:** prosodic hiatus, as often with emphatic monosyllables. For the interrog. tone, see Müller 1997: 121–2 and 205n. Sostrata was so wrapped in her thought that she did not realize she is being overheard. **exclūdēre:** 2nd. pers. sing. fut. pass. (213n). Parmeno wants to spare her further humiliation (e.g. 189–90), though the plot also demands that Sostrata be kept ignorant of what is happening within Phidippus’ house.

340 ehem: an expression of surprise, e.g. *An.* 686 *Mysis!* :: *quis est? ehem Pamphile, optume mihi te offers*. See Luck 1964: 69–77, Müller 1997: 37–9. Only now does Sostrata fully realize who has called out to her. **tun = tu + ne.** **eras:** the imperf. indicates an action begun in the past and continuing in the pres. Cf. *Ad.* 901 *ehem, pater mi, tu hic eras?* ‘Father! Have you been here all along?’ **misera:** 336n.

341 uisam: delib. subjunc. **in proxumo hic:** for the redundancy, probably a colloquial touch, cf. 98 *hic intus*.

342 non uisas: the echo (anaphora), as at 346, indicates agreement: 101n. **ne mittas quidem** ‘you shouldn’t even send’. **quemquam:** least of all himself, the likely candidate for the chore. Parmeno explained his aversion to entering the house at 327–35.

343 qui: *is qui*, as often in introducing a maxim. Parmeno is regaining his self-confidence. **quoi eum quoi,** the rel. pron. of the following double dat. construction. **ipsus:** this metrically convenient nom. of *ipse* is common in drama. See Ernout 1953: 96. **duco** ‘believe, reckon’ (*OLD* 30a). Maxims are

used in the play, e.g. by Laches (199, 201) and Parmeno (307), to lay claim to moral authority.

344 inanem ‘futile’ (OLD 13a). **capīt:** the *ī* that occasionally appears in Pl. and T. where we expect a short vowel by nature probably results here from an anceps syllable at diaeresis. Examples of the phenomenon in Laidlaw 1938: 60–3. **illi** ‘to the other person’.

345 uidere: 189n. **ut** ‘as soon as’ (OLD 26a) with perf. indic. **quid agat** ‘how she’s doing’, a common colloquial sense of *ago* (OLD 21f).

347 hēm istoc verbo: for the confluence of prosodic hiatus (ensuring the exclamation receives its due) and iambic shortening, cf. 103n. The word in question is, literally, *uenit*, but *uerbum* also means the sentiment behind the word(s), as *Fu.* 175 *utinam istuc uerbum ex animo ac uere diceret*, ‘if only you said that truthfully and from the heart’.

348 te: subj. of *ire*. The hyperbaton puts emphasis on *ea*, soon answered by *nam*. **hōc:** this adv. of motion towards (*hō* + *-ce*) is interchangeable in comedy with the more familiar *huc*. It is usually explained as instrumental in origin, though it may represent an old ‘directive’ case (so Weiss 2009: 354).

349 quippiam ‘at all’, the neut. sing. with adv. force (OLD s.v. *quispiam*² 1c). **Philumena:** 337n. **dolores:** not simply a synonym for *morbus* (330), since the word also embraces the kind of mental distress that might be thought eased by Pamphilus’ return. The word is more literally apt than Parmeno realizes; cf. Pl. *Cist.* 140–1 *puellam peperit . . . sine doloribus*.

350 scio ‘I’m sure’. Parmeno’s assertive self-confidence is of course misplaced. **sola soli:** Parmeno imagines, somewhat improbably in this household aflutter, a private conversation between husband and wife.

351 quae . . . interuenerit: the first of two ind. quests., a common construction with *narro*, that defines *res*. The perf. subjunc. reflects the fact that the breach between the two women has already taken place. (Sense thus precludes the possibility that this is a rel. cl. with a fut. perf. indic., though ambiguity of form can create legitimate confusion between a defining rel. cl. and an ind. quest. See in general Bräunlich 1920: 44–74, and for this passage Bräunlich 1918: 65.) **ortumst:** for the indic. cf. *Ad.* 513 *ut res gestast narrabo ordine* and 273n. above. The shift of mood in consecutive ind. quests. depending on the same verb is also found in T. at 873–4 and *An.* 649–50. See Stephens 1985: 195–8 for these and other examples. The variation may well be *metri causa* (Bräunlich 1918: 72 4).

352 eecum: 246n. Not much real time has passed since Pamphilus entered the house at 326, but comedy requires only the suggestion, not the reality of elapsed time for off-stage action: Duckworth 1952: 130–2. **tristist:** sadness is among the easiest emotions for a masked actor to suggest, and introducing the word here

makes the task easier still. *lacrimas* below (355) will add further detail as word and action combine to produce the required effect. For the larger issue of masks and expression, see 74n.

353 gaudeo uenisse saluom: a familiar variant of the formula for greeting a returned traveller, also found at *Hau.* 407, *Eu.* 976, *Ph.* 255, 286, 610, *Ad.* 80–1, *Pl. Bac.* 456, *Cur.* 306–7, *Mos.* 448, 805, *Poen.* 686 (Knapp 1907: 301, Bagordo 2001: 59–60). The acc. subj. is therefore unnecessary, as 62n. **saluan** = *salua* + *ne*. Her immediate thought for Philumena gives the lie to Laches' accusation, 209–13.

354 meliusculast: an evasive dim., which will not satisfy Sostrata, though it is literally true since the birth will have relieved Philumena's physical distress. **faxint:** 102n.

355 recte 'it's OK', another evasive reply (*OLD* 10b).

356 quid... tumulti: 97n. A few fourth declension nouns in early Latin received a gen. in *-ī* on the model of *dominus, dominī*. Thus *An.* 365 *nil ornatī, nil tumultī* (Ernout 1953: 66–7, Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 103–4). Models for Sallust's *senatī decretum* (e.g. *Cat.* 30.3, 50.1) can be found in inscriptions (Weiss 2009: 251). Sostrata refers to the commotion first reported at 317.

357 ita factumst: Pamphilus, otherwise at a loss, readily embraces the reason she has suggested. **quid** 'what kind of' with part. gen. (*NLS* §77 ii). **cotidiana** 'daily' (quotidian) in the sense of chronic, not acute. **ita aiunt:** yet another carefully evasive phrase. The implicit inconsistency of sudden onset (*repente inuasit*) and chronic fever (*cotidiana*) is a mark of Pamphilus' improvisation.

358 sodes: 70n. It softens the imper., as does *mea mater*. Pamphilus, anxious to keep his mother from darting on impulse next door, gently guides her toward her own house. **fiat:** a submissive expression of agreement (Thesleff 1960: 20). Sostrata now returns to her house. Her son, despite *iam*, will not soon follow.

359 pueris: the slaves bringing Pamphilus' baggage (*onera*) from the harbour. Travellers in Roman comedy generally arrive with a retinue of porters, whose procession can provide ample opportunity for stage business (Knapp 1907: 299–300, Prescott 1936: 114–17). Their absence from Pamphilus' arrival at 281 was something of an innovation – a mark of T.'s characteristic restraint (314n.) – that both facilitated his characterization as despairing lover and now provides a convenient excuse for getting Parmeno safely out of the way before he discovers the truth of Philumena's condition. **curre:** comic slaves generally run *onto* the stage with a message, not off it. Parmeno is consistently prevented from playing his expected role, though this is not, strictly speaking, an inversion of a running-slave scene (*pace* Knorr 2007: 169–72). See 799 headnote. **adiuta:**

constructed with dat. of the person (*is* = *eis*) and acc. of the thing, i.e. 'help them with the bags', *locutio antiqua*, says Don.

360 quid: an exclamation of surprise and protest (*OLD* 10). Parmeno knows he is being got rid of and does not like it. Nor does he like being treated like a porter. **qua** 'by what road' (adv.), with *uiam* in prolepsis, a colloquial alternative to *non sciunt qua uia* . . . The adv. is directional in origin, not an instrumental abl. (Vine 2010). **cessas:** Pamphilus responds with some impatience to Parmeno's objection: Morris 1890: 41–2. Stage business accompanying the slave's reluctant exit here combines with the tibicen's modulation from iambic to trochaic rhythm to set the coming monologue apart from the preceding action.

III.iii: Pamphilus (361–414)

T. has, virtually without known precedent in the comic tradition, centred his play squarely on a mystery: why did Philumena leave her mother-in-law's house? Whereas dramatists generally built suspense through anticipation and irony by telling the audience from the outset more than the characters know, T. much preferred to let knowledge develop more naturally out of the action itself. In this play he has run a particular risk by leaving everyone uncertain about the 'what' and the 'why' of the crisis at its core. Until now, Pamphilus discovered the truth on his visit to Phidippus' house, and he is about to share that sudden knowledge with the audience. The following monologue thus marks an important turning point in the action, but its function is not exclusively expository. We have heard of Pamphilus from a distance and watched him fret before our eyes, but this is our first chance to know him directly by learning what he values and what he fears and seeing how he reacts to that knowledge and fear. He speaks to us directly, and so his response to the truth of Philumena's condition is as much a matter of character development as plot. The richness of the monologue, full of genuine emotion, vivid description, and reported speech is especially effective at bringing the off-stage action to life. Older scholarship suspected the conflation of a monologue (361–77) and a scene of dialogue (378–402) in the Greek original (Schadewaldt 1931: 13–16, Denzler 1968: 69–74), but Menander's fondness for embedding direct speech in monologue is increasingly appreciated (Nünlist 2002). A complex narrative like this recalls Demeas' monologue at Men. *Samia* 206–82 and its equally remarkable use of reported speech, which may help explain how (if T. is staying true to the structure of his model) Apollodorus gained a reputation as a 'disciple' of Menander. For the role of suspense in comedy, see Duckworth 1952: 231–5, and for the risks T. ran by creating uncertainty here, Goldberg 1986: 159–62; for the monologue, Denzler 1968: 69–74, Lefèvre 1999: 76–81.

The monologue proper (361–408) is in trochaic septenarii, the usual metre for recitative in Roman comedy. The music ceases on the entrance of Parmeno and the baggage porters at 408, at which point Pamphilus reverts to iambic senarii.

362 unde = *ex quo* [*initio*]. **necopinanti** sc. *mihi*. **accidunt**: hist. pres. The rel. clause expands the implicit *ea*, obj. of *narrare*.

363 partim . . . partim: what Pamphilus saw with his own eyes (365–77) and what he learns from Myrrina (378–402) will form the first two parts of the coming monologue.

364 qua . . . propter: tmesis emphasizes the pron.; cf. *quapropter* (311). **exanimatus** = *conturbatus* (Don.), also used of a distraught lover at *An.* 131, 234, Pl. *Cas.* 573, *Mer.* 220, *Ps.* 9. **citius**: the comparative is intensive, i.e. ‘as fast as possible’. **foras**: T. exploits the convention that all significant speech either take place or be reported on the stage. The excited Pamphilus *must* speak, and the empty street is the safest place he can find to do so. Taking the audience into his confidence seems to strengthen his resolve.

365 modo: that moment came at 326. **timidus**: not hesitant, as *corripui* shows, but anxious (i.e. *timens*) about what he may find inside. He was still under the impression that his wife is seriously ill.

365–6 alio . . . ac: a comparative expression; cf. *Ph.* 530 *ego isti nihilo sum aliter ac fui* ‘I am no different than I was’. Word order reflects Pamphilus’ agitation, the delayed *uxorem* emphasizing both his commitment to Philumena and the shock of his discovery. **ei mihi**: a favourite exclamation of despair in T. (Müller 1997: 138). Pamphilus cannot complete his thought. The true nature of Philumena’s *morbus* becomes explicit only at 382, reported in Myrrina’s words.

368 id quod ‘with reference to the fact that’. The pron. introduces an adverbial clause explaining *laetae* (*NLS* §241).

369 uoltum . . . inmutari: joy gives way to agitation when they realize what Pamphilus’ appearance will mean. **omnium** ‘of every one of them’ (*OLD* 4a). Cf. *Hau.* 385–6 *quom . . . uitam tuam considero | omniumque adeo uostrarum*, ‘when I consider your life and the lives of each one of you’. The hyperbaton produces a slight emphasis.

372 eius uidendi cupidus: gen. of the gerund with a gen. obj. is extremely rare, *Hau.* 29 *nouarum qui spectandi faciunt copiam* being the only sure Terentian parallel. (*Ph.* 176 is textually suspect.) The construction might simply be a conflation of *eius cupidus* and *uidendi cupidus*, a mark of Pamphilus’ agitation (*NLS* §206 n. iii). **recta**: sc. *uia*. The messenger hoping to give advance warning of Pamphilus’ arrival instead leads him directly to his wife, one small example of the play’s many unintended consequences.

373 morbum: the continuous elisions of the line stop here, putting (ironic) stress on the word. Pamphilus still cannot speak the truth directly. **miser**: he continues to think first of himself.

374 posset: *morbum*, i.e. Philumena's condition, is the subj. **spatium:** 13on., here governing a final clause brought forward for emphasis.

375 alia ac: 365–6n. **res:** her condition. She is about to give birth. **ipsa**, sc. Philumena. Pamphilus alludes to the labour pains that are a comic convention, e.g. *An.* 473, *Ad.* 486–7, *Pl. Aul.* 692.

376 facinus: what was the outrage? Don. takes an indulgent view: *non ad illam, hoc est Philumenam, sed ad auctorem uitii refertur* (and ad 377, *non 'iratus' sed 'percitus'*), but Pamphilus' character as represented so far suggests instead that the *incredibilis res atque atrox* that so horrifies him is the mere fact of his wife's pregnancy so early in the marriage. The suggestion of rape does not emerge until 383, and even then his sympathy is limited. **inquam:** hist. pres., as often when reporting direct speech. **corripui:** Pamphilus rushes out exactly as he rushed in (365).

378 mater 'her mother'. Pamphilus, who might well have referred to Myrrina by name or acknowledged their relationship (e.g. *socrus*), instead distances himself from the family. Don. again reads his motive indulgently – *ostendit affectum misericordiae suae 'matrem' dicendo potius quam 'Myrrinam'* – but Don.'s conventional views of character ill suit so unconventional a situation and leave him largely blind to the play's moral unpleasantness. For his critical outlook, see Jakobi 1996: 158–75. **ut . . . exirem:** temporal *ut* (*OLD* 25) normally takes the indic. in T., e.g. *Ad.* 405 *ut numerabatur forte argentum, interuenit*. The subjunc. may be concessive, as in 296. Some editors emend to *exieram*. **ad genua:** a traditional pose of supplication, especially poignant for a matron of Myrrina's evident character (e.g. 250, 271) in her own house.

380 omnibus . . . sumus: Don. quotes Apollodorus, οὕτως ἕκαστος διὰ τὰ πράγματα σεμνὸς ἦεν καὶ ταπεινός 'thus each was high or low through circumstances' (a somewhat different restoration at *PCG*, fr. 11). As becomes clear at 536–9, Myrrina had reservations about her daughter's marriage: Pamphilus' remark may hint at an earlier tension between them.

383 uitiumst oblatum: a common euphemism for rape in comedy, e.g. *Ad.* 296, 308. The verb, says Don., often refers to unexpected or unwanted events. **uirgini:** before her marriage. Married women in Roman comedy are faithful to their husbands, the charade by Acroteleutium in *Pl. Mil.* and the genuine dilemma of Alcumena in *Am.* being the two notably problematic exceptions. Adultery was a theme for mime, not the *palliata*. **nescioquo improbo:** a disdainful expression.

384 tē atque: the hiatus is required since elision would obscure the pron. **celaret:** 32on. Secondary sequence after *confūgit*. Myrrina has now resolved the play's first mystery.

385 sed: transitional, not adversative; cf. *An.* 43, *id gratum fuisse . . . sed hoc mihi molestumst*. **orata** 'what she said'. A substantive use of the part., though

not the exact equivalent of *orationem* (381). So too at 575, ‘what we asked’. **nequeo quin** ‘I can’t keep from’. Only here in T., but fairly common in Pl., e.g. *Mil.* 1342 *nequeo quin fleam*, or with infin. as *Men.* 253, *nequeo contineri quin loquar*. **lacrumem**: both Pamphilus and Myrrina (379) weep over the same event, but not quite for the same reason.

386 quaeque = *quaecumque*. **fors fortuna**: Fortuna (Chance, Gk. Tyche) and Fors Fortuna (Good Luck) had separate temples at Rome, the latter dating back to the reign of Servius Tullius (Var. *L.* 6.17, Tac. *Ann.* 2.41, Plut. *Quaest. rom.* 74, Don. ad *Ph.* 841). Pamphilus’ discovery is the result of *good* luck because he is the male thought most likely to be sympathetic to the women’s dilemma. **nobis**: diaeresis after the fourth foot clearly marks this as the ind. obj. of *obtulit*.

387 ambae: Myrrina speaks for herself and her daughter, aware that Philumena has the greater claim to his sympathy. **ius . . . fas**: human law and divine law. The Roman formulation elides the difference between the Athenian and Roman laws relevant to this situation. At Athens, sexual impropriety (*moicheia*) by a wife required her divorce, and serious legal risks faced any husband willing to raise a child whose claim to citizenship could be challenged (Cohen 1991: 99–122, Scafuro 1997: 201–11). Romans, less preoccupied with the integrity of the household, had a looser standard: Cato’s claim in his speech *De dote* (fr. 222M) that an adulterous wife could be killed with impunity reflects not any actual licence but his outrage at the prevailing standard (Hallett 1984: 237–40, Scafuro 1997: 216–18). In taking up a child (*liberum tollere*), a male accepted responsibility for raising it without necessarily acknowledging paternity (Watson 1967: 77–82, Rawson 1991: 12, 26–7).

388 aduorsa ‘troubles’ (*OLD* 4), a neutral term. **tecta tacitaque**: neither seen nor heard of (Don.). **sient**: 145n.

389 umquam . . . amico: Myrrina alludes to the early days of the marriage, when Philumena endured his callousness without complaint (145–59) and won his love (161–70), a simultaneous appeal to Pamphilus’ affection and remorse.

390 sine labore ‘without trouble’. **illa**: sc. *gratia*. **rogat**: Myrrina pleads her daughter’s case, not her own (cf. 387).

391 ceterum (adv.) ‘for the rest’ (*OLD* 5a). **de redducenda**: non ‘*de respuenda*’ (Don.). The verb carries an inevitable echo of *uxorem ducere*. Myrrina hints at the possibility of reconciliation, which is what taking Philumena back would necessarily require. **facias**: the jussive subjunc. suggests advice or admonition rather than command, e.g. 638 *accipias puerum* (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 231–2). **in rem**: 102n. Don. detects an allusion to the dowry, which would have to be returned along with the wife. That possibility will not be lost on Phidippus (502).

392 solus consciu’s: the metrical phrase emphasizes the sense.

393 aiunt: the source of this information can only be Philumena. The indefinite plural reflects Myrrina's discomfort with this subject. **post duobus . . . mensibus:** adv. + abl. for the time interval (*OLD* 2b), e.g. Pl. *Aul.* 798 *tua gnata peperit, decumo mense post*. Myrrina's time scale – the marriage not consummated for two months and the wedding itself now seven months in the past – is consistent both with Parmeno's vaguer statement at 145 and Pamphilus' immediate realization that the child about to be born was conceived before their marriage (376). The seven-month pregnancy is not in itself impossible by ancient reckoning (Schadewaldt 1931: 2–4), but it is not so easily reconciled with Phidippus' later statement that the birth comes *et recte et tempore suo* (531). See Appendix I.

395 quod: the situation described in 393–4. **ipsa res** 'the facts themselves', esp. Pamphilus' response to the pregnancy. Cf. *Ad.* 478–9. **potis est** = *potest*. *potis*, found in the *SC de Bacch.* (*POTISIT* = *potis sit*), is common (along with *pote*) in Pl. and T. and remained in conversational Latin through the late Republic. Virgil revives it as an archaism (*Aen.* 3.671, 9.796, 11.148), and it endures in later poetry as a metrically equivalent substitute for *potest* (Ernout 1953 §256, Fordyce 1961: 203–4).

396 clam: adv. + acc. (*OLD* 2b). **patrem:** Phidippus.

398 abortum esse 'there was a miscarriage'. Either the verb (*aborior*) or the noun (*abortus*): even Don. is unsure. The impersonal expression reflects Myrrina's distancing of actions from agents. No embarrassing questions would arise following a miscarriage, since Pamphilus' paternity would be assumed as *ueri simile* (399).

399 eum: sc. *puerum* (310n.).

400 exponetur: the usual solution in drama for the problem of an unwanted child. The frequency of exposure in real life, and thus the relationship of dramatic convention to actual practice, is controversial. See Patterson 1985: 115–16 (Greece), Harrison 1994: 12–15 (Rome), Scafuro 1997: 272–8 (comedy and myth). Phidippus' discovery of the newborn child will eliminate this possibility (516–27). **hic** 'in the present case' (*OLD* 5); cf. *An.* 458, *si hic malist quicquam* 'if there's any trickery in this business'. **nil . . . quicquam:** 67n.

401 contexeris: fut. perf., in effect the apodosis of a fut. condition. Where the simple fut. leaves the result indefinite, the fut. perf. suggests certainty of fulfilment. Cf. *Ad.* 817–19 *haec si uoles . . . uere cogitare . . . dempseris molestiam* 'if you're willing to think this through completely . . . you'll really save a lot of trouble'.

402 seruare . . . fidem: hyperbaton lends some emphasis to the phrase, with the diaeresis encouraging a secondary emphasis on *certumst* (454n.).

403 nam: transitional, not explanatory (*OLD* 4). **de redducenda:** 391n. Pamphilus, out of either cowardice or kindness, has made the easy promise to

Myrrina about the pregnancy: what to do about his wife is the more difficult problem facing him. He has yet to discover how his promise here will complicate the larger situation. **ne utiquam** ‘by no means’ (adv.). Written as two words in dramatic texts. **honestum**: as at 151, Pamphilus thinks first of respectability, not sentiment. His greater obligation is toward appearances. See 866n.

404 etsi: *pro ‘tametsi’* (Don.). **amor . . . eius**: obj. gen. Pamphilus, confirming the truth of Parmeno’s account (169–73), speaks like a comic lover. Cf. *An.* 277–80 (another Pamphilus, suspected of disloyalty), *adeone me ignauom putas . . . ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor | commoueat neque commoneat ut seruem fidem?* His feelings seem genuine (*hoc cum gemitu*, Don.), but he will lack the moral anchor to weather the emotional storm that the conflict between respectability and affection raises. **consuetudo** carries the connotation of a sexual relationship (*OLD* 5, cf. 555n.).

405 quae . . . uita: the indirect quest. provides the subj. of *uenit*. For the mood, see 273n. Pamphilus’ tears are clearly for himself.

406 data: all MSS of T. read *bona*. Don., equating *fortuna* with *bona fortuna*, emends to *data*, and modern editors follow him.

407 prior amor: the affair with Bacchis.

408 quem: sc. *priorem amorem*. **consilio** ‘deliberately’ (*OLD* 6). **mis-sum feci** ‘abandoned’ (*OLD* 4). **idem**: masc. nom. **huc** = *ad hanc rem*. Most MSS read *huic* (sc. *amori*), but the meaning is unchanged. The loss of a mistress has taught Pamphilus how to endure the loss of a wife.

Some commotion in the wing marks the end of Pamphilus’ narrative. He must now confront an immediate problem.

409 cum pueris: Parmeno arrives from the harbour with the baggage from Imbros (359n.).

410 adesse ‘to be present (as a participant)’ (*OLD* 7). Parmeno’s involvement might lead him to reveal what Pamphilus hopes to keep secret. **olim soli credidi**: Pamphilus recalls (and confirms) the report at 145.

411 in principio: for the first two months of marriage (393). **datast**: 362n.

413 parturire: the acc. subj. is inferred from *eius*. **aliquo** ‘somewhere’. Keeping Parmeno at a distance soon becomes a source of comedy in a play that strictly rations the truth.

414 ablegandus: gerundive used personally (*NLS* §203). **dum parit** ‘until she gives birth’ (*OLD* 5a). T. uses the pres. indic. when the coming event is considered certain, e.g. *Eu.* 206, *expectabo dum uenit*. Potential or provisory events

are indicated by the subjunc., e.g. *Ph.* 480, *mansurusque patruum pater est dum huc adueniat* (*NLS* §223a).

III.iv: Parmeno, Sosia, Pamphilus (415–50)

The scene division is again artificial, for the action is continuous. Parmeno enters from the wing in conversation with a fellow slave, Sosia, accompanied by a train of porters (thus *ite*, 429) as Pamphilus withdraws toward his own house door (*ante ostium*, 428) to plan his next move. They will not see him until 428, a dramatic convenience facilitated by the elasticity of stage geography and the tendency of masked performance both to narrow the actors' vision and focus the audience's attention (Duckworth 1952: 122–4, Marshall 2006: 159–61). Their brief conversation provides comic relief after the high drama of Pamphilus' revelation, while postponing his moment of decision.

415 ain = *aisne*, a colloquialism indicating a conversation already in progress. Ind. statement follows; cf. *Ad.* 517, *ain patrem hinc abisse rus?* **incommodum**: Parmeno's straight line introduces a conventional complaint, for the unpleasantness of sea travel has a long history, e.g. *Pl. Mos.* 431–43, *Trin.* 1087–9. Thus his less than sympathetic response (418, 424). The traditional dialogue and attendant stage business contrast with the extraordinary nature of the dilemma that surrounds it.

416 hercle: a mild intensifier, gaining weight from its position (58n.). See Müller 1997: 139–42.

417 tantum quam: *OLD* s.v. *tantus* 2c. The horrors of sea travel are beyond description, though Sosia does not lack words to complain about them.

419 praeterieris: perf. subjunc. in ind. quest. **es ingressus**: the indic. in a causal clause emphasizes the fact, not the causal connection (*NLS* §159). Contrast 564, where *qui postule*m explains *why* Phidippus calls himself *stultior*.

420 mittam = *omitam*. Cf. *Ph.* 293, *mitto omnia* 'Forget all that.'

421 plus eo: neut. sing., since *dies triginta* is taken as a single unit of time; cf. *Hau.* 62–3, *annos sexaginta* . . . *aut plus eo* 'sixty years or more'. A month for such a voyage is an exaggeration, even with bad sailing weather.

423 usque: *vel* 'diu' uel 'ualde' (Don.). **usi sumus** 'we experienced' (*OLD* 11).

424 clam me: 261n. **aufugerim**: perf. (potential) subjunc. Even the dangers of flight are preferable to those of a repeat voyage, an allusion to slave behaviour that prompts Parmeno's rejoinder below (*causae leues*, 426).

425 eo: to Imbros.

427 minitare: 2nd pers. sing. verbs of promising, threatening, etc. are often followed by pres. rather than fut. inf. (e.g. *An.* 613, *Eu.* 520, *Ph.* 532). **facere ut faceres:** traditional wordplay (cf. *redeam-redeundum*), as suits a traditional type of banter between slaves. **Sosia:** Parmeno's companion finally gets a name, though he is dismissed at 429 and never returns. Cf. the equally dispensable Sosia of *An.* 28–171.

429 ite: the command is to Sosia and the porters he is directing. **ego:** the emphatic pron. shows that this line is addressed to Sosia, not to himself or the audience. **siquid:** colloquial *si* 'whether' is more common than *num* for introducing ind. quest. in T. (*NLS* §182(6), Ernout-Thomas 1953: 319–20). Cf. *Eun.* 594, *sto exspectans siquid mi imperent*.

Sosia and the porters enter Laches' house. Parmeno then turns toward Pamphilus.

430 ere: the usual form of address for slave to master (188n.). **etiam** 'still' (*OLD* 1a). Cf. *Hau.* 188 *incertumst etiam quid se facit*, 'It's still unclear what he'll do with himself.' Parmeno had left Pamphilus at just this spot, poised to re-enter the house (358). **quidem:** the verb, not the pron. is emphasized, i.e. 'not only am I still here, but . . .' (Solodow 1978: 98–100). **quid est:** Parmeno, accustomed to lending a sympathetic ear (144n.), expects a new confidence.

431 arcem: the acropolis. Though the acropolis was the religious heart of Athens, it was hardly a centre of daily life like the agora. Pamphilus demands a long, hard climb to what is in effect a remote location. A Roman audience might think of climbing the Capitol. **transcurso:** pass. part (327n.). **quo:** in seizing upon the ambiguity of the impersonal construction, Parmeno hopes to avoid the imminent order.

432 quid eo: a comment on the improbability of the locale, not allayed by the reason about to be given. **hospitem:** the word implies acquaintanceship based on some exchange of favours, though it is all only a fiction. Cf. *Ad.* 529, *cliens amicus hospes nemost uobis?*

433 Myconium 'from Myconos' in the Cyclades. This fool's errand builds on one likely truth of Pamphilus' recent voyage: Aegean winds and currents favoured a clockwise return from Imbros via Samos and perhaps Icaros, then on through the Cyclades to Athens (Arnaud 2005: 223–8). A stop at Myconos is thus not as improbable as might at first appear. **conueni:** imper.

434 hunc: Pamphilus. It was common for a traveller to make some vow in hope of a safe return. **dicam:** delib. subjunc.

436 cessas: Parmeno's joke about the oath was spoken aside. Pamphilus heard only silence and so comments on Parmeno's apparent delay, as at 360, 814. For the handling of such asides, see Duckworth 1952: 111–12, Bain 1977: 156–8. **quid uis** + subjunc. *ut* is generally omitted, e.g. *An.* 708, *Hau.* 846, *Eu.* 1054,

though we find *Ph.* 322, *quid uis nisi uti maneant?* (*SEL* 1.216). Pamphilus has in his anxiety neglected to think through his plan.

437 immo: the particle corrects the preceding question by adding the required instruction (*OLD* 1e, Thesleff 1960: 66–7). **constitui:** 195n.

438 non posse: the answer to *quid uis dicam*, i.e. *dic me non posse eum conuenire*. **ne . . . expectet:** the meaning is clear and the construction the same whether the clause is identified as prohibition or neg. purpose. **illi:** 94n. **uola:** the metaphor is not unparalleled (*OLD* 3b).

439 at . . . at: the words of Parmeno's legitimate query are echoed in Pamphilus' fanciful reply.

440–1 Alliterated lists in asyndeton are traditional in Roman comic style, though more common in Pl. than T. (Duckworth 1952: 340). *Ph.* 1061–2 is a more modest example.

440 crispus 'curly-haired'. Don. quotes Lucilius on the proverbial baldness of men from Myconos (*Myconi calua omnis iuuentus*, fr. 1211M, cf. Plin. *Nat.* 11.130, Strabo 10.487). T. may have changed his model (*cum Apollodorus caluum dixerit*, Don.) to heighten the absurdity of Pamphilus' description by reversing the stereotype.

441 cadauerosa facie: a weighty descript. abl. positioned to summarize the string of nominatives. Its incongruity after *rubicundus* and *crassus* is part of the joke. The humour of Pamphilus' incoherent description recalls Syrus' improvised directions at *Ad.* 573–84. **perduint:** 134n.

443 maneto: fut. imper. for an action not, like *curre*, to be immediately fulfilled (*NLS* §126). **non queo:** this does not, in itself, sound like an exit line. There must be some significant stage business as Pamphilus sends Parmeno on his way. (*hoc in gestu et spectaculo plus est*, Don.) The words, as so often, are only part of the play (Panayotakis 2005).

With Parmeno out of the way, Pamphilus turns again to the audience.

446 partum: explaining preceding *hoc* and *quod*. **mulieris:** Myrrina. The sentiment is vaguely condescending, as if her trouble had little to do with him.

447 quod potero: the firm resolve of 402 is already crumbling on reflection. **tamen ut:** a limiting clause (*OLD* s.v. *tamen* 5a). **pietatem:** the bond between Roman mother and child could be strong (Hallett 1984: 243–50), though there has been no sign yet of such a bond between Pamphilus and Sostрата. The emotion and affection displayed at their reunion were all on her side (352–8, 301n.). The sincerity of Pamphilus' invocation of *pietas* in choosing mother (*parenti*) over wife (*amori*) is thus not completely clear. See Konstan 1983: 135–8.

449 attat: an expression of pain in Attic tragedy and tragic parody (ἀττατᾶι, Soph. *Phil.* 743, 790, Aristoph. *Nu.* 707) becomes a colloquial expression of abrupt

change, often of surprise tinged with alarm, in Latin (e.g. Acc. fr. 138R, Cato *Orat.* fr. 171, Pl. *Aul.* 411, T. *Ann.* 125). **eccum:** 246n.

450 horsum = *hō* + *uorsum*, ‘this way’; cf. *hōc* (348n.).

The stage business attending Parmeno’s exit brought Pamphilus to the opposite side of the stage, where he now remains out of view as the old men enter.

III.v: *Laches, Phidippus, Pamphilus* (451–515)

Laches had insisted on following Phidippus to the forum (273) and has apparently been impossible to shake. Their return now recalls their earlier conversation, when Phidippus had said that his family was awaiting Pamphilus’ return before taking any further action (246–73). The old men therefore believe their problem is nearing a solution, which gives them a confidence that only makes Pamphilus’ dilemma more difficult.

The tibicen accompanies their entrance, and the dialogue continues in trochaic septenarii, the most common metre for recitative.

451 dixtin = *dixistine*. **dudum:** i.e. at 268–9. **illam:** sc. Philumena (not Myrrina), as the subj. of *redeat* makes clear.

452 factum: sc. *est*, a common expression of agreement in comic dialogue, e.g. Pl. *Poen.* 1067 *an mortui sunt?* :: *factum* (Thesleff 1960: 20–1). **causam** ‘excuse’ (*OLD* 5); cf. 677. The sentence is spoken aside to the audience.

453 quem . . . loqui: addressed to Phidippus. Laches catches the sound, but not the sense of Pamphilus’ remark. He then turns in Pamphilus’ direction and recognizes his son, though not in time to hear 454. The overheard aside that brings characters together is found in both Greek and Roman comedy (Bain 1977: 158–61). Pl. subjected it to much formal elaboration (Marshall 1999: 120–5), but T. tends to use the device with restraint (e.g. *An.* 267, *Hau.* 517, *Eu.* 86).

454 certum . . . est: a frequent expression of resolution (e.g. 402, 583, *An.* 311, *Eu.* 188, 269, *Ph.* 551, *Ad.* 718). Word order shows that *affirmare* is complementary, with the infin. clause *uiam . . . persequi* as its obj. **uiam:** to keep the pregnancy secret (402) or to abandon his wife (448–9)? Pamphilus echoes the language of the former course, but his thought clearly leans toward the latter (Don.). His decision now gives him the confidence to address his father.

455 ipsus: 343n. **mi pater:** the possessive in direct address is a mark of affection common between family members, women and men alike, though more commonly used by women when speaking outside the family group (232n.).

456–7 Polite variations on the formulaic greeting to returned travellers (353n.). Phidippus is clearly pleased and relieved to see him, but Pamphilus’ cool response to his greeting (*minus blande*, Don.) reflects his wariness over the trouble to come. *credo* is regularly used in the active voice to acknowledge a kindness, e.g. *Ph.*

610 *uenire saluom uolup est. ∴ credo*. Pamphilus' acknowledgement is deliberately impersonal.

458 aduenis modo? 'Have you just arrived?' The pres. indic. with an adj. of time becomes the equivalent of a pres. perf. (*SEL* 1.17–18, and above 336n.). Laches may be wondering how much his son knows about the domestic crisis. **admodum:** not strictly true, but Pamphilus wants to postpone questions about his wife's condition. **cēdō:** this imper. particle (pl. *cette*), in origin an aorist <*kedō with iambic shortening (Meiser 1998: 185, Weiss 2009: 422, 434), can mean either 'hand over' (*OLD* 1) or, as here, 'tell me' (*OLD* 2). **Phania:** the deceased relative on Imbros (171). Laches' interest in a possible inheritance is direct to the point of rudeness, especially in his neighbour's presence, but his bluntness is of a piece with his bullying of Sostrata (205–42). Avarice, as T.'s Micio tells his brother Demea, is a vice of old age (*Ad.* 833–4).

459 sane hercle 'decidedly' (*OLD* 4a). Pamphilus, knowing his father well, answers his *quid?* as if it were *quantum?* **homo** 'an individual', a faintly derogatory usage (*OLD* 3b).

460 sic: *uoluptati obsequens*. **haud multum = parum** (Don.).

461 relinquant: normal Republican spelling, e.g. *consentiont, nequinont* (Ernout 1953: 153–4). Cf. *saluom* and *uiuom* below, 464. **uixit, dum uixit:** the play on *uiuo* 'to be alive' (*OLD* 1) and *uiuo* 'to live it up' (*OLD* 7) is common on epitaphs, e.g. *CIL* II.391 (*CLE* 485), *uixi ter denos annos sine crimine uitae. uiuite uicturi, moneo: mors omnibus instat*, 'I lived thirty years of life without fault. Live it up, doomed ones, I say: death hounds us all.' Phania sounds rather like Micio, *sibi uixit, sibi sumptum fecit* ('He lived for himself, he spent for himself', *Ad.* 865), in the companion piece at Paullus' funeral.

463 profuit: sc. *nobis*. **obfuit:** Laches can afford a conventional piety now that he knows some inheritance is coming his way.

463 uellem: imperf. potential subjunc. for a wish that cannot be fulfilled (*NLS* §121). **inpune:** Laches, thinks Phidippus, makes the wish precisely because it cannot be fulfilled. He knows his neighbour's character well but is apparently too mild-mannered to speak openly since Laches seems to hear neither this nor the following line. They are probably both spoken aside, though *malis* seems to preclude overt address to the audience.

465 ill': Phania. For the scansion, 120n.

466 heri: one truth is concealed in this fiction. The behaviour Laches had interpreted as longstanding odium between Philumena and her mother-in-law was presumably the girl's effort to conceal her pregnancy (219–22): only with the onset of labour the previous day did she actually return to her own family. Dramatic time is, as so often, greatly compressed. **hic:** sc. Phidippus. **dic:** spoken aside to his companion.

467 noli fodere ‘don’t jab!’ Spoken to Laches, whose instruction aside must have been accompanied by a sharp poke to get his attention. Phidippus does as requested (*iussit*), but the initiative throughout remains with Laches. Phidippus’ reported commands are themselves products of his passivity and of a piece with his admissions at 245, 271. **scilicet:** like ‘of course’, an all-purpose expression of agreement (Thesleff 1960: 32).

468 omnem rem: the logical subj. of *sit gesta* (360n.). **modo:** the statement (unlike 458) is largely true, though what Pamphilus knows is different from what the old men think they know. His confidence rises, since Laches’ fiction has unwittingly revealed his ignorance of the true situation. Pamphilus delivers the line, says Don., with an affected sadness (*uultuose et cum supercilii tristitia*). See 74n.

469 istos inuidos: Laches, assuming that Pamphilus has acquired his knowledge on the way from the harbour, is annoyed to be the subject of malicious gossip. **perdant:** 134n.

470 ulla merito contumelia ‘any legitimate reproach’. The word more commonly means ‘insult’, as *Ph.* 971–2 (also of a mistreated wife). The declaration is explicitly belied by 164–6 and by implication at 157, 302–3, but the fathers do not know this.

471 a uobis ‘your family’. Pamphilus pointedly ignores his father, addressing this speech, and probably 485–92, to Phidippus alone. **idque:** obj. of *memorare*, explained by the ind. quest. *quam . . . fui*. **hic** ‘at this point’ (*OLD* 6). **uelim:** the potent. subjunc. makes for a modest assertion, e.g. *Ad.* 521–2 (Ctesipho’s apologetic wish for his father’s incapacity) *ita se defetigarit uelim ut triduo . . . nequeat surgere* ‘I’d like him to so exhaust himself that he won’t be able to get up for three days.’

472 fideli . . . benigno . . . clementi: hardly words to describe Pamphilus’ treatment of his wife (470n.). **fui:** the indic. gives the lie an aura of fact (273n.).

473 possum: sc. *memorare*. *possum* itself may suggest potentiality, but the indic. often appears in the (likely) apodosis of a hypothetical condition, e.g. *Ad.* 32 *uxor, si cesses, . . . te amare cogitat* ‘A wife, if you’re late, imagines you’re in love’, *Pl. Cur.* 299 *recte monstrat, si imperare possit* ‘His instructions are good, if he were able to give them.’ See 266n. and *SEL* 1.274–6, Ernout-Thomas 1953: 247–8, 381–2, *NLS* §200. **ni** ‘if it were not that’ (*OLD* 6b). **te:** not *uos*. Laches is excluded. **ex ipsa:** Philumena, as he knows perfectly well, is in no position to tell her father the truth.

474 erit . . . fides = credetur, similarly constructed with dat. obj. **ingenio** ‘character’ (*OLD* 2). *bene non ‘dictis’* (Don.): Pamphilus, for good reason, rests his appeal on who he is, not on what he has just said.

475 quom . . . dixerit: fut. perf. indic. in a temporal clause (3oon.). **in me . . . de me:** the chiasmic order is noteworthy, as is the etymological and grammatical play on *iniqua* and *aequa*; cf. 274. The elegance of the expression diverts attention from its tendentiousness.

476 mea culpa: Pamphilus thinks this is true, since Philumena's departure was the result of her pregnancy, not his behaviour in the early days of their marriage. By withholding the truth about that pregnancy – a truth almost certainly revealed in Apollodorus' original prologue – T. has eliminated a moment of delicious irony. See Introduction 3.2.1. **discidium** 'separation', a neutral term here, though divorce is implicit in the situation. Contrast 782 *nīl malī discīdio dignū*. See 48on.

477 quando 'since' (*OLD* 3). The indic. in a causal clause is common in Pl. and T., e.g. *An.* 818 *duc me ad eam, quando huc ueni*. **indignam:** 'unsuited to' (*OLD* 3). This sense requires a rel. clause with a subjunc. that is either generic or concessive (*NLS* §158). Cf. *Eu.* 865–6 *nam si ego digna hac contumelia sum maxume, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen*, 'Even if I thoroughly deserved this outrage, you were not entitled to inflict it.' **matri meae:** obj. of *concedat*.

478 concedat 'defer to' (*OLD* 3b). **cuiusque:** *matris. mores* in the sense 'quirks' also produces an adj. *morosus* 'hard to please', like the *morosa uxor* of Caecilius' *Plocion* (fr. 158R.). Pl. *Trin.* 669 puns accordingly, *is [Amor] mores hominum moros et morosos efficit*, 'It makes men's manners foolish and fretful.' **modestiā:** the case is certain since metre requires the scansion *suā*. A good wife should yield to her mother-in-law and accept her ways (*mores*) with deference (*modestia*). Philumena's departure, says Pamphilus, shows her refusal to do so. He has shifted all blame to his wife, which is ungenerous, but perhaps not as cruel as admitting the real reason for her departure.

479 gratia 'good will' (*OLD* 2).

480 segreganda: *mollius 'segreganda' quam 'excludenda'* (Don.). Pamphilus chooses his words (and his construction) with care. He is laying the ground for a permanent separation since the child represents for him an insurmountable obstacle to reunion, but he is not yet prepared to make any declaration of permanence to Laches and Phidippus. The gerundive lends an air of inevitability to the decision while obscuring his responsibility for making it.

481 matris: defines *commodum* (not obj. gen. with *pietas*), as the diaeresis makes clear; cf. 495. **suadet:** construction with inf. clause (*me . . . sequi*) is rare in T.

482 Pamphilus was speaking to Phidippus, but Laches replies with his characteristic self-importance. Don. hears in his speech, which means little more than *recte locutus es*, the loquacity of old age. **inuito:** dat. with *mi*. **tuos:** nom. masc. sing.

483 quom: 23on. **postputasse:** similar praise similarly expressed at *Ad.* 262 *quī omnia sibi post putarīt esse prae eo commodo*, 'How he subordinates all his own

affairs to my interest!’ **parente:** *matre*, but the word keeps Laches implicitly in the picture. The alliteration gives his opinion the weight of a maxim.

484 uerum uide ‘just be sure’. Laches cannot counter an appeal to *pietas*, but he may suspect it is only a pretext. **ira** ‘indignation’. His advice reflects his own temperament. **insistas** ‘proceed’ (*OLD* 2c).

The music ceases, and a brisker iambic rhythm replaces the trochaic septenarius as the dialogue becomes argumentative.

485 iris pulsus: Pamphilus echoes his father’s words. The generalizing plural reflects the lack of any particular complaint. **illam:** Philumena. **sim:** the ‘repudiating’ subjunc. turns the original statement against itself, e.g. *Ad.* 83 *quid fecit? :: quid ille fecerit!* ‘What has he done? :: What has he done!’ (*SEL* 1.186–7, *NLS* §175).

487 quod nollem: sc. *factum*. **meritam:** sc. *quam*. Pamphilus carefully balances *quae* and [*quam*], *commerita* and *meritam*, *nollem* and *uellem*.

491 cum eo uiro: divorce is implicit in this wish. **qui sit:** clause of characteristic.

492 necessitas: ironic. The fathers may hear in this the appeal to *pietas*, while Pamphilus actually means his inability to accept Philumena’s out-of-wedlock pregnancy. The whole speech is a striking combination of fact and fantasy, and Pamphilus may himself be unsure here where one fades into the other. Though he no doubt loves his wife (cf. 167–70, 260, 325–6) and is genuinely distraught, his horror at her condition (376–7) belies the claim she has done him no wrong, and Myrrina’s contempt for the unknown rapist (*nescioquis improbus*, 383) belies the possibility of a second, happier marriage for her. And finally, though Pamphilus’ sanctimonious appeal to *pietas* may claim the admirable goal of saving Philumena’s reputation, renouncing her and her child could be understood, at least by a Roman audience, as a sign more of priggishness than any legal or moral necessity, since the Roman extended family had mechanisms for embracing such children (cf. Rawson 1986: 173–86 on so-called *alumni*). How this scene is played – a loving, if hapless Pamphilus caught between conflicting obligations or a self-righteous Pamphilus entangling himself in face-saving lies – will eventually determine the impact of the play’s resolution.

493 id: the result of *necessitas*. **in manu** ‘in your power’, with an inevitable echo of Roman marriage *cum manu*, which put the wife under her husband’s legal control. A true statement, which is why Pamphilus can make no reply. **sies:** 145n. Laches, frustrated by Pamphilus’ obstinacy, cannot complete his thought.

494 iube: the order of an order. Laches’ *patria potestas* puts this command within his power, though getting Pamphilus to obey it is another matter. The reality of the parent-child relationship is inevitably more complex than the legalities on which it is based (Cokayne 2003: 153–9). **consilium** ‘my intention’. An

indirect refusal: Pamphilus responds more clearly by action – he takes to his heels.

495 seruibo = *serviam*; cf. *scibo* (246n). **quo abis?** Pamphilus turns away at this point: the following words are addressed to his retreating back. *quo* = ‘just where do you think . . . ?’ Characters in ancient comedy always return to the stage from where they left it, and since Pamphilus’ return at 577 is from Laches’ house, where he is going now is perfectly obvious. Laches’ question reflects annoyance, not curiosity. Pamphilus, frustrated, makes another abrupt exit at 706. The effect of such sudden exits is noted by Brown 2007: 182–3.

497 dixin: the statement was at 261–2. **hanc rem:** Philumena’s return to her parents’ house.

498 orabam ‘I kept asking you’. The imperf. implies insistence in the past, as *An.* 83–4 *observabam mane illorum seruos uenientis aut abeuntis*, ‘Every morning I’d watch the slaves coming and going.’ Laches shifts the blame from his son to his neighbour.

499 inhumanum: 86n.

500 ita: introduces an indignant question, e.g. *Ph.* 231 *utane tandem uxorem duxit Antipho iniussu meo?* ‘So Antipho has now married without my permission?’

supplicaturum: not just begging, but with the connotation of seeking forgiveness. Phidippus does not like to think of himself as the offending party.

501 si est ut = *si euenit ut*. The connotation is chance, not possibility, as at *Ph.* 925, *Ad.* 514, and below 558, 637, 724.

502 alio animo: descript. abl. **huc** ‘to me’ (*OLD* Id), i.e. ‘into my hand’, accompanied by a gesture of irritation (Don.).

503 tu quoque: quick to challenge others, Laches does not like being challenged by Pamphilus and now Phidippus. **proterue:** *immoderate et superbe* (Don.).

504 percontumax ‘very stubborn’, a unique word in extant Latin. The hope that Pamphilus’ return would itself resolve the crisis has been dashed. Phidippus, like Laches, calls out in annoyance, but only after Pamphilus is safely inside.

505 merito: Laches tries to be conciliatory, but the implication that Pamphilus has some legitimate cause to be angry only feeds Phidippus’ bitterness.

506 paullum . . . pecuniae: the inheritance from Imbros. *paullum* is a synco-pated form of *paululum*. Phidippus falls back, somewhat illogically, on the idea that Philumena is no longer considered a suitable mate now that Laches’ family has grown a bit richer.

507 etiam mecum ‘with me, too’ (*OLD*, s.v. *etiam* 3). Laches is blithely unaware of the offence he has just caused.

509 uelitne: sc. *redducere uxorem* (501). **ut...siet:** a consecutive clause, where the potential subjunc. describes the possible effect of the action (*NLS* §136). **alii:** dat. **non est:** the indic., found only in A, would mean she is no longer thought of as a wife. All other MSS and Don. read *sit*. The less vivid construction better accords with the choice at 501–2, but *sit siet* creates a difficult jingle.

510 ades: imper. **paucis:** sc. *uerbis* (abl.). Cf. *An.* 29 *ades dum: paucis te uolo*, ‘Stay a moment: I want some words with you.’ Phidippus, however, has turned from Laches and now enters his house. **abiit:** whether Laches speaks these words aloud to himself or ‘out front’ will have a significant effect on the audience’s experience of the play. See 274–80n. **quid mea?** sc. *refert*. A common expression in T.: *Hau.* 793, *Ph.* 389, *Eu.* 849, *Ad.* 881, 913. *mea* is probably abl., understanding the *re* of *refert* (*NLS* §213).

512 hic: accompanied by an impatient gesture toward Laches’ door. **obtemperant:** constructed with internal acc. + dat. The pl. after *nec...neque* follows sense, not grammar. Cf. *Ad.* 103 *haec si neque ego neque tu facimus... ‘If neither I nor you did these things...’*

513 parui: gen. of value. **porto** ‘convey’ (*OLD* 1b). Colloquial pres. for fut., often found with verbs of motion (*SEL* 1.18–20). **iurgium:** since no quarrel has actually taken place, perhaps better understood predicatively, with *hoc* the situation and *iurgium* the coming quarrel with his wife, viz. ‘I’ll take this as a complaint to my wife.’

514 quouis with *consilio*. **consilio** ‘scheming’ (*OLD* 5c), as often in comedy.

515 aegrest: 227n. **euomam:** a colourful expression, similarly employed by the angry Geta at *Ad.* 312 and Demea at 510. It has a distinctly vulgar connotation at Cic. *Phil.* 5.20 and Plin. *Nat.* 5.43 (of Antony), but this may be a later development. Enn. finds it suitable for epic, *Ann.* 374–5Sk. (of Servilius Geminus at Cannae) *cuncta malaque et bona dictu euomeret* ‘he would spill out everything both good and bad to say’. Cf. *uomit in mare* of the Tiber’s discharge (453Sk.). Laches hopes to take out on his wife the frustration caused by his son and his neighbour, fortifying his displaced anger with the conviction that everything must somehow be her fault.

Laches now enters his house in search of his wife, leaving the stage momentarily empty, though this vacant stage probably does not mark the end of Apollodorus’ third act. No significant time needs to pass between 515 and 516: the interval required for the action Myrrina is about to describe was provided by the ‘link monologue’ of Laches that has just ended. A rapid sequence of exits and entrances between Phidippus’ departure at 510 and return at 521 has good comic force, though a brief musical interlude is also possible. The tibicen is certainly playing again for Myrrina’s entrance.

IV.i: Myrrina, soon followed by Phidippus (516–76)

The expected confrontation between Laches and Sostrata never actually takes place. Instead, Myrrina bursts from her house in great distress, the new mood signalled by the resumption of musical accompaniment. The developing scene mirrors the argument of Laches and Sostrata at 197, only with roles and characters reversed: wife joined by husband (not husband by wife), wife as the stronger (not weaker) figure, though both Myrrina and Sostrata must endure their husbands' unjustified suspicion and abuse. 'Mirror scenes' were a structural feature of Athenian tragedy (Taplin 1978: 122–39), and a trace of tragic echo may remain here in the structure, the sight of a distraught woman rushing from the house (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 871, Eur. *Hipp.* 176), and in her language. Fifth-century tragic practice shaped the structures, plots, and characterizations of Menander's comedy (Hunter 1985: 114–36, Zagagi 1995: 50–9), and T. may have encountered a similar tragic debt in Apollodorus, though the Roman comic response to tragedy was less nuanced than the Athenian.

The excitement of the scene is enhanced by the music: rapid metrical shifts, predominantly trochaic lines of differing lengths with occasional moves to an iambic beat, suggest an agitated melody until Phidippus' exit at 565, after which the rhythm settles into iambic octonarii.

516 The anapaestic opening contrasts with the line's slower close, each phrase clearly marked *ut perturbatam ostendas* (Don.). **quo . . . uortam?** The tragic despair of Ennius' Medea (*quo nunc me uortam? quod iter incipiam ingredi?* 217–18J) not only echoes Eur.'s Medea (νῦν ποῖ τράπωμαι; etc., 502–5) but becomes a Roman stylistic benchmark and a cliché. Pl. *Cur.* 69–70 plays on the expression: *quo me uortam nescio. :: si deos salutas, dextrouorsum censeo*. Further echoes of the phrase in Goldberg 2005: 134–8. **respondebo:** the form makes clear that all three deliberative questions are indicative. Cf. *An.* 612 *nam quid ego nunc dicam patri? negabon uelle me . . . ducere?*

518 ita: the sound led Phidippus to rush in on his daughter. **corripuit:** a favourite verb for excited movement (365, 376).

519 quod: conj. **rescierit:** the syncopated perf. subjunc. represents a fut. perf. indic. in the condition reported by *scio* (NLS §280). **id:** sc. *eam peperisse*, thrust to the head of its clause for emphasis. **clam . . . habuisse** 'kept secret' (OLD s.v. *clam* 1b). The subj. is *me*, obj. is *id*. Myrrina's plan had depended on keeping the birth secret until the child could be removed (395–400). Phidippus' inadvertent discovery now threatens everything.

520 The catalectic dimeter (the last trochee of the second metron lacks its final syllable) brings this emotional speech to a strong stop. It is then punctuated by a loud sound from the door behind her.

521 concrepuit: ancient house doors may in fact have creaked upon opening as their wooden pins rubbed in the frame, but the sound became a conventional entrance formula in comedy (Duckworth 1952: 116–17, Bader 1971). The interruption is further marked by the momentary shift to iambic rhythm. **nulla sum:** 319n., here perhaps with another paratragic ring, as Pl. *Cas.* 621 *nulla sum! nulla sum! tota tota occidi!*

522 ubi ‘when’ (183n.). Phidippus enters, looks around, and speaks to the audience. He does not immediately see his wife, who has moved downstage. **se duxit:** Don. recognized the colloquial synonym for *abiit*. So Pollio familiarly to Cic. (*Fam.* 10.32.1) *Balbus . . . duxit se a Gadibus* ‘Balbus has taken himself off from Gades’ (Bailey).

523 atque: exclamatory (*OLD* 2b), e.g. Pl. *Men.* 898 *atque eccum ipsum hominem!* ‘There’s the very man himself!’ **quid ais?** The formula here has a peremptory, indignant tone, as at *An.* 301, 665, *Eu.* 334, *Ad.* 556. **heus** ‘Hey!’ brusque and familiar, as *Hau.* 743, *Ph.* 152, *Ad.* 776 (Bagordo 2001: 127–8 and above 339n.). Phidippus must attract her attention, since Myrrina at first refuses to see him. **tibi dico** ‘I’m talking to you!’ The phrase maintains the peremptory tone (e.g. Pl. *Cur.* 516, *Mil.* 434). **mihine, uir?** An expression of feigned innocence (‘Who, me?’), as *An.* 849 and 50.

524 uir . . . sim: Myrrina’s words are thrown back at her; cf. 485n. **adeo hominem** ‘at least a human being’. A husband merits special regard; anyone else at least deserves not to be trifled with; cf. 214 *lapidem, non hominem*.

525 utrumuis: neut. since Phidippus is thinking not of being a *uir* or *homo* but of the treatment that status merits. **mulier:** pejorative, as 214. **forem** = *essem* (Ernout 1953: 178).

526 ludibrio: 149n. **quibus:** sc. *factis*. Myrrina feigns innocence but also wants to find out what her husband knows. **rogitas:** the frequentative of *rogo*, common in Pl. and T., is both colloquial and metrically convenient.

527 hem! Phidippus’ surprisingly blunt statement evidently provoked some physical response from Myrrina. **ex qui?** Archaic abl. (Ernout 1953: 87). This will emerge as *the* question of the play, though not even the audience yet knows – though an experienced audience might well guess – the answer. The solution to the play’s first question (why Philumena left her husband’s house) only led to a second question (how to handle the embarrassing truth); more hinges on the answer to this third question than anyone yet realizes. **patrem:** sc. *filiae*. Myrrina turns her husband’s suspicions against him.

528 perii! A characterizing expression for Myrrina, most effective if spoken aside as she struggles to parry her husband’s questions. Cf. 540, a clear address to the audience. **datast nuptum** ‘given in marriage’. Supine + verb of motion yields a stock expression; cf. *An.* 301, *Ph.* 720, *Ad.* 346. A direct statement

since *obsecro* is parenthetical. Answering a question with a question proves to be a successful strategy of avoidance for Myrrina.

529 credo ‘I suppose so’ (*OLD* 8c). **neque adeo** ‘nor, for that matter’ (*OLD* 6c). **patris est** ‘it is a father’s role’, a predicative gen. (*NLS* §72 n. iii), e.g. *An.* 187 *patris est*, *Ad.* 734 (736) *est hominis*. **demiror**: the prefix is intensive; cf. *derepente* (368, 518).

530 celare: 320n. for the double acc. Phidippus assumes that Pamphilus, too, has been kept in the dark.

531 et recte et tempore suo: two reasons for concealing a birth would be an abnormal delivery or an untimely one (Don.). For the problematic chronology of this pregnancy, see Appendix I.

532 peruciaci . . . animo: descriptive abl. **esse**: the exclamatory inf. with acc. subj. omitted, e.g. *Ph.* 497 *adeone ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili!* (227n.). **praeoptares**: strict rules of tense sequence do not operate in result clauses. Because the general statement (*peruciaci esse animo*) was true in the past as well as now in the pres., the impf. subjunc. is used of an action originating in the past (*NLS* §162–3). **perire**: 400n. Phidippus has not been told of this intention, but readily infers it from the secrecy surrounding the pregnancy and birth.

533 ex quo . . . scires: a concessive rel. cl. (*NLS* §156). Why destroy a child (*ex quo*) who would be the agent of *amicitia* between the two families (*inter nos*)?

534 lubidinem: 245n. **esset . . . nupta**: the impf. subjunc. after *ut* in 532 with the part. *nupta* ‘married to’ (*OLD* 1d). Cf. *Pl. Am.* 99 *Amphitruo . . . quicum Alcumena est nupta* and 538–9 below. Plupf. subjunc. *esset nupta* would not provide the required sense.

535 etiam ‘also’ (*OLD* 3b). **illorum**: Pamphilus and Laches. Phidippus had previously suspected them of conspiring to dissolve the marriage (499–509). **quae**: sc. *culpa*. **penes**: the prep. commonly follows its noun (*OLD* 3). Phidippus, like Laches at 229, puts the blame solely on his wife.

536 istuc: *utinam uere sis misera* (Don.). Phidippus shows no more sympathy than Laches had at 207, though Don. also reports an alternative interpretation: *utinam in hoc negotio miseram te, non scelestam reperiam!* Much depends on whether the following *sed* introduces an opposing reality (‘but in fact,’ *OLD* 4b) or implies a further observation (*OLD* 2c). Phidippus seems fond of the former, transitional *sed* (272, 544, 668, 725, 769). His explicit response shows that Myrrina’s lament was *not* spoken aside.

537 cepimus ‘chose’ (*OLD* 9b), *elegimus* (Don.). Phidippus readily claims an active role in arranging the match. Accounts offered from the other side suggest the initiative lay elsewhere (123–4, 240–2, 295).

539 qui amaret . . . pernoctaret foris: the generic rel. is causal (*NLS* §156). The reference is to Pamphilus' behaviour before his marriage and Myrrina's objection to him then as a prospective son-in-law, though it is equally appropriate to the early days of their union (157–9).

540 mauolo: only here in T., though common in Pl. at line end. (*Ps.* 728 is the sole example within a line.) Myrrina clearly speaks aside here, presumably to the audience. Her responses at 547–8 and 556–9 will encourage Phidippus in this error.

541 amicam: sc. Bacchis. A woman's *amica* is a female friend (e.g. 592), but a man's *amica* is almost always a lover. Thus the *psaltria* bought for Ctesipho in *Ad.* is an *amica* (800), but Cicero's friend Caerellia is his *necessaria* (*Fam.* 13.72.1).

542 uitium: predicative. Subj. of *esse* is *id.* Phidippus' tolerance of youthful excess as a general principle (thus *adulescentiae*, not *Pamphili*) recalls Micio's similar declaration (*Ad.* 101–5), and both fathers expect such behaviour eventually to be curbed by marriage. The juxtaposition of male and female perspectives here is striking. Since comic convention favours the male view, T's articulation of Myrrina's contrary response to Pamphilus' conduct is significant, even though it comes to us in her husband's words (537–9).

543 iam aderit: sc. *tempus*. So, in a similar context, Pl. *Bac.* 417 *iam aderit tempus quom sese etiam ipse oderit*. **quom oderit:** i.e. *ut paeniteat sui facti* (Don.). The jingle *aderit . . . oderit* is a desired effect; cf. similar jingles at *An.* 218, 280, *Hau.* 526.

The return from general principle to specific argument is marked by a brief shift from trochaic to iambic rhythm in lines 544 to 546. The metrically ambiguous string of heavy syllables in 544 facilitates the modulation. Myrrina's reply at 547 returns to septenarii.

544 ut olim . . . eadem: the more common correlate for *ut* would be *sic* or *ita*. Phidippus continues to hold Myrrina's previous objection to the marriage against her. **nil cessauisti** 'you have never ceased', a true perf., as indicated by *usque adhuc*.

545 Two final clauses expressing purpose. In the second of these, tense sequence is preserved by understanding *ratum* as an adj., as at *Ph.* 951 *quod dictum indicitumst; quod modo erat ratum inritumst*, 'What was said is unsaid; what was just agreed is cancelled' (cf. *esset nupta*, 534 above). A plu. perf., however, could be justified as referring to an action envisioned as completed in the past; cf. the clear violation in primary sequence at 841 *uide . . . ut attuleris*. See Ernout-Thomas 1953: 414–15, *NLS* §149 n. 2. Laches levelled a similar charge against Sostrata at 240–2.

546 id: subj. of *factum (esse)* but thrust to the front of the line for emphasis. **indiciū . . . facit** ‘shows’ (*OLD* s.v. *indiciū* 4c); cf. *Ad.* 617 *id anus mi indicium fecit* ‘the old woman showed me this’.

547 peruicacem: Myrrina’s rejoinder turns her husband’s words at 532–3 against him. **quoi:** antecedent is *filiam* (545). Syntactically, the clause belongs with the ind. statement introduced by *censes*.

548 ex usu nostro = utile nobis (*OLD* s.v. *usus* 11c). Also at *Hau.* 210, *Eu.* 1077. Myrrina’s evasive question encourages Phidippus to focus on Pamphilus’ infatuation with Bacchis as a motive for the rupture, thus distracting him from further inquiries about Philumena’s pregnancy and its result.

549 nostram in rem: the prolepsis creates a colloquial tone.

550 qui . . . diceret: classical rules of syntax might lead us to expect *qui uidisse dicebat*, or possibly *qui uidisset*. The present construction seems to conflate the subjunc. of ind. statement implicit in *audisti* with the potentiality of *fortasse*. Phidippus’ convoluted syntax reflects his agitation. **eum:** Pamphilus. The missing acc. subj. *se* is to be inferred from *qui*.

551 exeuntem . . . euntem: the predicative part. is preferred by T. (and common in Pl.) after verbs of perceiving because it is felt to be more vivid than the acc. and infin. alternative (*SEL* II. 433, *NLS* §94). **quid tum postea?** The expression, like *quid tum* [sc. *sequitur*]?, asks for the next step in an argument or a narrative.

553 magis humanumst: so at *Hau.* 99–101 Menedemus faults himself for lacking such indulgence, *coepti non humanitus neque ut animum decuit aegrotum adultcentuli tractare*. Phidippus expands on the principle enunciated at 542. What is *humanum* has long been considered a major theme (and innovation) of Terentian comedy: here it consists of turning a blind eye to marital infidelity (*ea dissimulare*) as long as it is conducted discreetly (*modeste ac raro*). See further 555n. **dare operam** ‘to take pains’, constructed here with *scire*. **qui** (adv.) ‘by which means’ (*OLD* *qui*² 3a). The subjunc. is consecutive (*NLS* §136). Pamphilus would presumably not like to be found out: Phidippus therefore prefers to maintain appearances than to reveal the truth.

555 quicum: the archaic abl. is used for all genders. (The oldest MSS of T. actually read *quacum*: Don. makes the correction.) In comedy, the prep. always follows this form of the pronoun. **consuesset:** a common, mild euphemism for a sexual affair, e.g. *Ph.* 873, *Ad.* 666. Thus Don. *proprie dicitur in stupro* (not in Adams 1982, but see *OLD* 3b). The plupf. subjunc. is concessive. T. uses the noun *consuetudo* for a relationship with either a wife (404n.) or a mistress (*An.* 110, 279). **tot . . . annos:** the affair with Bacchis was clearly of long standing (114–16, 684), which is why Philotis, away for two years, was still surprised to learn of its termination. **hominem:** what constitutes appropriate conduct, i.e. conduct

befitting a human being (*humanum, inhumanum* and their cognates), is a recurring theme in T. (e.g. 86, 214, 499, 553; cf. *An.* 236, *Hau.* 99, 1046, *Eu.* 880, *Ad.* 145, 471, 687). A similar interest (and similar vocabulary) is found in Menander, e.g. *Asp.* 164, *Mis.* 302, *Perik.* 137, *Sam.* 17–22, fr. 650 K-T (ἀνθρώπινος), *Asp.* 395, *Dys.* 105, *Sam.* 35 (φιλανθρώπος) but is hard to parallel in Pl. (*Mer.* 319, *Mos.* 814). T. is often credited with introducing this sensibility to the Romans (e.g. Haffter 1953: 96–100, Bianco 1962: 19–21, Ludwig 1968: 180), but the most famous declaration of Terentian *humanitas* (*homo sum: humanum nil a me alienum puto*, *Hau.* 77) excuses a busybody who will be justly faulted for being *iniquos* (1011) and acting *nimis inhumane* (1045). Here, too, the moral sensibility is undercut by the context as Phidippus argues, somewhat illogically, that Pamphilus' suitability as a husband rests on *not* severing his ties to Bacchis. (He will have a different opinion at 696.) T. is a deeply ironic moralist.

556 uirum: i.e. *maritus*. Phidippus made a similar distinction at 524. **mitte** = *omitte* (420n.). Myrrina abandons the effort to defend herself, focusing instead on what remains to be done.

557 solum solus: the reading of A. Don. read *solus solum*, which Lindsay prints in the OCT, but A.'s slower scansion better reflects Myrrina's insistence that the matter be kept secret. For the jingle, cf. 350 *sola soli*. **conuēni:** imper.

558 roga uelitne: the key question for Myrrina, a smaller one than the question of parentage (527) but more pressing. At 391 she left this decision to Pamphilus. **si est ut:** 501n.

559 redde: sc. *uxorem*. **sin:** introduces an alternative possibility, strengthened, as at 780, by *autem*. **recte . . . consului:** what advice is meant, the departure from her husband's house (as Phidippus believes) or the decision to hide the pregnancy? She is deliberately vague. The only thing clear is her insistence on protecting her daughter from further unhappiness.

561 peccatum: taken closely with *in eo* above. Their separation ensures each its emphasis. **fuera . . . par:** the plupf. in the impersonal expression suggests that the principle held true before or independent of the immediate time in question. So too at 867; cf. *Eu.* 870, *Ph.* 651 *ita ut aequom fuera*. Further examples in *SEL* 1.52–3. **ea:** acc. pl. subj. of *prospici*, displaced for alliterative effect. The verb is ambiguous. Phidippus means to say 'by whose counsel these things should have been arranged' (*OLD* 4a), but *prospici* can also mean 'anticipated' (*OLD* 3a). His irritation at not being consulted is thus unwittingly couched in terms of his own obtuseness.

562 incendor ira: the expression of feeling introduces an infin. clause; cf. *An.* 42 *id gratum fuisse . . . habeo gratiam*, 191 *omnes . . . grauiter sibi dari uxorem ferunt*.

563 interdico: a very strong, legalistic verb of prohibition, like *edicam* just below. Phidippus is prone to such ineffectual pomposity (244n., 268). **extulisse . . . uelis:** *uolo*, *expeto*, and *oportuit* all appear in T. with a perf. instead of pres. inf., perhaps echoing legal language, e.g. *SC de Bacch.*: *nequis eorum Bacanal habuisse uolet*. Cf. the jussive sense of the perf. subjunc. (e.g. *nihil feceris*) and βούλομαι + aor. inf. (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 259–60).

564 stultior ‘very foolish’, intensive, not comparative. **qui postulem:** 419n. The line is spoken aside, probably with a gesture to accompany *hanc*. As at 270, Phidippus acknowledges his own weak nature. He hopes to have more success commanding his slaves.

With Phidippus’ exit the rhythm shifts to iambics. The scene that opened with Myrrina’s expression of despair ends with a second monologue addressed to the audience. Each of these contains a vital expository element (517–20, 572–4), simultaneously advancing the plot and encouraging the audience to identify with the women’s dilemma.

566 me miseriorem recalls Myrrina’s original distress (*misera*, 516). Her husband’s attitude has only worsened her situation.

567 ut: interrog. adj. ‘how’ (*OLD* A.1b) appears twice in the line, first looking to the future (*laturus sit*, cf. Pl. *Epid.* 377 *scitis ut futura sint*) and then to describe the present state (*siet*). **hoc:** i.e. *ipsam rem*. Phidippus believes the baby is legitimate. His decision to protect it (565) further limits the options she set out at 396–401.

568 clam me: 261n. **quom:** causal, 230n. **hoc:** the concealed pregnancy. The somewhat clumsy repetition of *hoc* perhaps reflects her distress. **leuius:** 292n.

569 qua uia = *quomodo*. T. plays on this sense at *Ph.* 566 *qua uia istuc facies?* :: *dicam in itinere*. **sententia:** the decision to keep the child. The word echoes the formality of *interdico* (563) and *edicam* (565).

570 relicuom fuerat: for the tense, 561n. So Barsby: ‘it will be the last straw if . . .’

571 puerum ut tollam: ‘acknowledge the child’. The phrase recalls less the legal formalities attendant on a birth, which were in any case minimal, than the attendant publicity; cf. Stat. *Sib.* 4.8, Gell. 12.1 with Dixon 1988: 237–40. For the legalism of *liberum tollere*, 387n. **qui . . . pater:** T. writes *quis hic est homo?* (*Eu.* 676, *Ph.* 991), but prefers *qui* in reported questions, e.g. *Eu.* 658, *Ph.* 129, 354, 356, and 573 below.

572–4 We learned at 383 that Philumena’s pregnancy was the result of an assault. Now we learn that in the process she lost a ring to her attacker. Since Greek dramatists commonly provided such information in an expository prologue,

scholars generally assume that the information here derives from such a speech in T.'s model (Schadewaldt 1931: 17–18, Denzler 1968: 31–3, Lefèvre 1999: 39–40). Suppression of that speech creates the mystery and suspense that characterize T.'s play.

572 compressast: a polite euphemism for rape, e.g. *Ph.* 1017–18; *Pl. Aul.* 28–30, 33, 689; *Cist.* 158, 162, 178–9, 616; *Epid.* 540 (Adams 1982: 182–3). **forma** 'appearance' (*OLD* 4a), i.e. of the rapist. **quitast:** the pass. of *queo* is rare and probably archaic (*antique dixit*, Don.), the verb itself a back-formation from certainly archaic *nequeo*. It is of course essential to the convention that the girl be unable to recognize her assailant.

573 detractum ei: dat. The verb recurs to describe the same act at 829. **qui posset:** abl. The subjunc. is generic (*NLS* §155), the verb impersonal.

574 ui: the violence of the act is central to the description. Suppression of the omniscient prologue enabled T. to report the event from the perspective of its victims. *Who* provides the exposition is as important to the meaning of the play as when and how it is provided (Gilula 1979/80: 152–3). **anulum:** this crucial detail, deliberately postponed until line end and further emphasized by alliteration, will reappear with momentous consequences, at 821. Rings also effect recognitions in *Hau.*; *Pl. Cur.*, *Vid.*; *Men. Epit.*, *Perik.*, etc. Fourth-century comic dramatists probably appropriated the device from tragedies like *Soph. El.* and *Eur. Auge:* the title Δακτύλιος ('The Ring') is attested for Alexis, Amphis, Menander, Philemon, and Timocles (Arnott 1996: 153–4, Scafuro 1997: 272–80, Traill 2008: 260–3, and for Plautine variants on the idea, Csapo 1989: 162 n.77). A rapist might with greater probability lose a ring at the scene of his crime, as Charisios did in *Epitrepontes* (406–50), than take one from his victim: T. (or Apollodorus?) may be playing with the convention. Whether the familiarity of the ring motif undercuts the suspense here or gently moves the audience from suspense to anticipation is an open question (Goldberg 1986: 160–2, Lefèvre 1999: 126–8).

575 Pamphilum: proleptic acc. (280n.). **orata:** 385n. She alludes to the conversation reported at 386–401.

576 alienum puerum 'another man's child'; cf. 649, and Clitipho's fear about his own status at *Hau.* 1024–9. New Comedy at its most perceptive explores not just the question of legitimacy inevitable in plots based on rapes and seductions, but its characters' response to the challenge of legitimacy and its opposite. Thus Menander's Demeas and his son Moschion both grapple with the awkward fact of a child at *Sam.* 134–42, leading Moschion to ask (rhetorically, but with thematic significance) τίς δ' ἐστὶν ὑμῶν γνήσιος . . . ἢ τίς νόθος; 'Which of us is legitimate . . . and which a bastard?' (137–8). Pamphilus in this play will discover that the question is not as simple as he thinks.

Myrrina follows her husband into the house. (The exit is unmotivated and unidentified, but there is no other place for her to go.) She will not return. The stage is only empty for a moment: the rapid opening and closing of house doors without contact between the neighbours reflects the larger failure of communication between neighbours that is at the centre of the action. For the directorial decisions demanded by an empty stage, see Marshall 2006: 176–81.

IV.ii: Sostrata and Pamphilus, to be joined by Laches (577–606)

Sostrata and Pamphilus, in earnest conversation, enter from their house. Mindful of her own reputation and anxious to secure her son's happiness, Sostrata volunteers to facilitate Philumena's return by retreating to live with her husband in the country. Yet her quiet decency, however admirable, only adds to Pamphilus' predicament, and the ironic humour of his discomfort helps counter the seriousness of her declaration. The affection and earnestness of her speech have been noticed since antiquity (Dutsch 2008: 18–21).

The motivation and direction of exits and entrances is generally clear and consistent in Roman comedy (Duckworth 1952: 118–21), but T.'s representation of interior space here might be questioned. Sostrata entered her house at 358, Pamphilus, presumably, at 495, and Laches at 515. We know that Laches encountered her inside (515, 582), but how Pamphilus succeeded in avoiding him is left entirely to the audience's imagination.

Their dialogue continues the iambic octonarii of the preceding scene.

577 Non clam me: the unwitting echo of 568 unites Sostrata and Myrrina in their response to adversity. **suspectam:** pred. adj. with *esse* (*OLD* s.v. *suspectus*¹ 1a). *Why* she is viewed with suspicion is explained by the following inf. clause. The connection is more logical than syntactic: Don's gloss, *in suspitione me tibi esse*, suggests that he, too, had difficulty explaining the construction. **uxorem:** not 'Philumenam'. The marriage itself is the victim.

578 mores 'behaviour', but with the idea of who she is, not any one thing she has done; *An. 395 propulsabo facile uxorem his moribus* 'with this character I'll easily drive off a wife'. Cf. *Ad. 160 audi ne te ignarum fuisse dicas meorum morum*, 'listen up so you won't say you didn't know my ways'. **ea:** a vague pl. for what could properly be sing.

579 ita . . . ament: 106n. **optingant:** the suppressed pl. subj. is inferred from *quae*. What she hopes to get from Pamphilus is the *pietas* a son owes his mother, as becomes clear at 584. Her language is elaborately polite. **ut:** rel. adv. coordinated with *ita* in the preceding oath.

580 merito: properly with *caperet*. The prolepsis creates the *figura etymologica* *commerui merito*, a favourite comic effect (Duckworth 152: 343–4). **mei:** obj. gen. with *odium*, subj. of *caperet*. cf. 219.

581 quod: 276n. A more prosaic order would be *et quod ante rebar, te me amare*.
ei rei: dat. with *fidem*.

582 modo ‘just now’ (*OLD* 5a). This was the encounter promised at 513–15. Conversation with Laches tends to be one-sided, and the verb may hint at that fact. **me habueris praepositam** ‘you’ve kept me preferred to’ (294n.).

583 contra: 70n. **gratiam referre** ‘to return a favour’ (*OLD* 4e), to be distinguished from *gratias agere* ‘to thank’ (4c) and *gratiam habere* ‘to feel grateful’ (4d). Sostrata makes clear that her decision is the result of love, not annoyance or jealousy.

585 mi Pamphile: 232n. The voc. marks the formal beginning of her announcement. **uobis:** a genuine pl. referring to the young couple. **commodum** ‘beneficial’ (*OLD* 4b). The word order emphasizes *hoc*.

586 certo decreui: a very strong resolution, like 454. Sostrata is determined. Laches must enter from the house at about this point to overhear their conversation, as his first speech indicates (607).

587 praesentia: i.e. her mere presence, not anything she has actually done. As at 578 (*propter meos mores*), Sostrata accepts responsibility without assuming guilt. **restet relicua:** the pleonasm, as at *Ad.* 444–5 (*reliquias restare uideo*), suggests the emotion of colloquial speech.

588 quaesio: little more than an intensive particle in questions and commands, less emotional than *obsecro* (*OLD* 3, Müller 1997: 97–9). Limited in T. to male speakers (Adams 1984: 58–61). **consili:** 97n. The noun can simply mean ‘plan’ (*OLD* 5b), but its more formal connotations may be evoked by *decreui* above.

589 stultitia ‘folly’. Cf. *Ph.* 659–60 *utrum stultitia facere ego hunc an malitia | dicam, scientem an imprudentem, incertus sum*, ‘I’m unsure whether to say he’s doing this out of foolishness or malice, deliberately or thoughtlessly.’ Pamphilus knows that Philumena left for a good reason, but the awkward truth traps him into a further lie. His disparaging, ungenerous comment plays up his *pietas* at his wife’s expense. **habitatum migres:** supine + verb of motion. See 485n. for the repudiating subjunc. No interrogative particle is required (*NLS* §175). Cf. *Ad.* 939 *anum decrepitam ducam?* ‘You think I’m going to marry a decrepit old woman?’

590 nobis . . . male dictum [esse] ‘to speak ill of us’, the complement of *uelit*. The clause is generic.

591 pertinacia ‘obstinacy’. Phidippus made such an accusation at 496. **modestia:** at 478 Pamphilus faulted Philumena for lacking this female virtue.

592 tum ‘moreover’ (*OLD* 9). The particle introduces a new argument. **festos dies:** a characteristically Athenian detail. Athenian women, whose public

lives were otherwise circumscribed, played a significant role in the religious life of the *polis* (Fantham et al. 1994: 83–96). Since festivals then provided a sanctioned opportunity for even young women to venture beyond the confines of the household, comic convention turned them into occasions for the sexual assaults that their plots so often required, e.g. Men. *Epitrepontes* (Tauropolia) and *Samia* (Adonia), less specific in Pl. *Aul.* (Ceres), *Cist.* (Dionysus). See Pierce 1997. T. does not specify an occasion for Pamphilus' encounter with Philumena: if Apollodorus mentioned a festival, the present detail may have created an irony lost in the Roman adaptation.

593 nil . . . uoluptatis: the hyperbaton creates emphasis for each part of the expression. **istaec res:** T. prefers *istaec* to *ista* as acc. neut. pl. or nom. fem. sing., even when there is no metrical advantage. The preference continues here with *istaec* for *istae*. Such 'reinforced demonstratives' are well attested in colloquial Latin into the early empire, e.g. at Pompeii (*CIL* 1² 2541), Vindolanda (343.19 at <http://vindolanda.csad.ox.ac.uk>). Friends, family, and festivals naturally formed the core of an Athenian woman's social life. Sostrata thus implies a shift in values with her advancing years.

594 aetatis tempus = 'youth' (*OLD* 4a). Cf. *An.* 286 *huius formam atque aetatem uides*, 'you see her beauty and her youth'. **tulit** 'permitted' (*OLD* 21). So *An.* 443 *dumque aetas tulit*. **perfuncta satis sum:** understand *rebus* from 593, i.e. 'I enjoyed them well enough'. Cf. Cic. *Fam.* 4.5.5 (Sulpicius Rufus on the deceased Tullia) *omnibus bonis perfunctam esse*, 'she enjoyed nearly all life's blessings'. It is a very rare usage. **satias:** the jingle, like the *figura etymologica* that creates it, is a desired comic effect.

595 studiorum istorum 'pursuits of that kind' (*OLD* 4). The adj. is mildly pejorative. Pamphilus, as is natural for the young, imagines his mother in a steady state of social activity, but she knows that change is inevitable with advancing years. Beneath the artificiality of the immediate comic situation lie fundamental truths about ageing and parent-child relations. **cura:** what children owe their parents in old age is an inevitable concern of family life, ancient and modern, though rather more acute for the parents (Cokayne 2003: 159–72, Parkin 2003: 204–16, 239–47). **nequoi:** tactfully indirect. The obvious such person would be her son. Contrast Laches' casual cruelty at 207.

596 mortemue expectet: sc. *nequis*. So on the difference between Demea and his indulgent brother, *illum ut uiuat optant, meam autem mortem exspectant scilicet*, 'They wish him to live; no doubt they're just waiting for my death' (*Ad.* 874; cf. 109). Death means the end of responsibility – and an inheritance.

597 hic: adv. **inmerito:** the implicit criticism of Philumena is muted by the generality of the statement. **tempus** 'the proper time' (*OLD* 8c).

598 praecidam 'take away' (*OLD* 4b).

599 et...et: the tense sequence implies that what the structure presents as two independent actions are in fact causally related. She will escape suspicion by indulging them (sc. Philumena's family). **illis morem gesserō** 'yield to their wishes' (*OLD* 6).

600 sine 'allow'. Imper. of *sino*, here constructed with acc. and inf. (*OLD* 2b), has a variety of colloquial meanings; cf. 707, 744. **hoc:** the charge voiced by Laches at 201. **uolguſ . . . mulierum** 'the whole class of women' (*OLD* 3); cf. *An.* 583 *uolguſ ſeruorum* 'the common herd of slaves'. **quod:** 276n. **male audit** 'hear themselves abused' (*OLD* 5b). The idiom, like Greek κακῶς ἀκούειν, provides a passive equivalent of *male dicere*. Cf. *Ph.* 359 *ſi erum inſimulabſ malitiæ, male audieſ*, 'If you accuse my maſter of ill will, you'll hear ill of yourſelf.'

601 abſque una hac foret 'were it not for this one thing' (*OLD* s.v. *abſque* 1). This conditional clause, always formed with *eſſet* or *foret*, iſ found only in comedy, here and *Ph.* 188, ſix times in Pl. The main verb (*ſum*) iſ indic. becauſe it referſ to a preſent fact. Pamphiluſ' (ſincere) exclamation iſ ambiguouſ. *hac*, for him, referſ to the pregnancy and rape that deprive him of hiſ (otherwiſe admirable) wife, and *autem* in 602 thuſ meanſ 'alſo' (*OLD* 3). Soſtrata, however, would hear in *hac* the odium that haſ apparently ſplit their houſeholdſ, and for her, *autem* iſ adverſative (*OLD* 2).

603 tute: 317n. **incommodam rem:** the vague expreſſion ſuitſ her non-confrontational character. She iſ aſking for no ſmall thing; cf. 153n. **ut quæque** = *quæcumque eſt* (*OLD* s.v. *ut* 19). **in animum induceſ:** 264n.

605 uae miſero mihi! An anguiſhed exclamation which, unlike the dramatiſally equivalent (maſculine) particle *ei*, iſ uſed in comedy by both men and women, enabling Soſtrata to echo hiſ wordſ (Adamſ 1954: 54–5, Müller 1997: 136–7).

606 quidem: a common converſational gambit in comedy, when a ſecond ſpeaker agreeſ with the firſt and addſ ſomething new (Solodow 1978: 111–12). Pamphiluſ haſ, characteriſtiſally, forgotten that he iſ not alone in hiſ troubleſ. **me male habet** 'botherſ me' (*OLD* s.v. *habeo* 22b). Various adverbſ appear in thiſ idiom, e.g. *bene* (*Ph.* 429), *inpune* (*Eu.* 1019).

IV.iii: Soſtrata, Pamphiluſ, Lacheſ (607–22)

Lacheſ entered from the houſe in time to hear Soſtrata's declaration at 586. He now comeſ forward to addreſſ hiſ wife. Hiſ intervention will end Pamphiluſ' effort to change hiſ mother's mind and thuſ inadvertently heightenſ the young huſband's dilemma. The action iſ continuous, but the change to a more varied rhythm beginniſ at 607 createſ ſome diſtinction between thiſ ſcene and what haſ come before.

607 cum istoc: sc. *Pamphilo*. **sermonem** ‘conversation’ (*OLD* 3a). **procul hinc** ‘back from here’. *procul* indicates the distance (not necessarily far away: *OLD* 1b), *hinc* the location. Laches has come forward and indicates with a gesture where (presumably near his house door) he had been standing to overhear their conversation. Sostrata’s decision either was taken after her meeting with him or, perhaps, he never gave her the opportunity to mention it. **uxor:** a gentler form of address than the rude *mulier* of 214. Her self-abnegation has his approval.

608 istuc est sapere: the logical sequel would be a complement to *istuc*, as *Ad.* 387–8 *istuc est sapere, non quod ante pedes modost uidere sed etiam illa quae futura sunt prospicere*, ‘This is wisdom, not to see just what is before your feet but also to recognize what will happen.’ Laches instead switches to a more personalized style of generalization, as at *Pl. As.* 323 *em istaec uirtus est, quando usust, qui malum fert fortiter*, ‘Well, that’s courage, if someone bears trouble bravely when it’s necessary.’ **qui** = *si quis* . . . *possis*. For the generalizing subjunc., see 58n. **ubiquomque:** 130n. The following subjunc. is causal.

609 post ‘later’ (*OLD* 2). **feceris:** the perf. subjunc. envisions a completed action. Doing now what you might anyway have to do tomorrow is, says Laches, true wisdom. The switch from iambic to trochaic rhythm lends the line additional force.

610 fors: 386n. **fuat:** pres. subjunc. As an alliterative archaism unique in T., though not especially rare in Pl., it is both appropriate to the invocation (de Melo 2007: 275–9, Ernout 1953: 165, 178) and suggests the conservatism often said to characterize women’s speech (Dutsch 2008: 200–2). **abi rus:** the command is abrupt and preemptory; cf. *Pl. Most.* 8 (one slave hectoring another) *abi rus, abi dierecte*. . . **feres** ‘put up with’ (*OLD* 20a); cf. *Hau.* 202 *nam quem ferret si parentem non ferret suum?* ‘Who would he put up with if not his own parent?’ Laches has long lived in the country apart from his wife and son (175, 215, 224–6). His grudging acceptance of her into his world now would represent a significant concession.

611 spero: guarded agreement. Sostrata presumably knows what she is bringing on herself. Cf. Laches’ callousness at 207. **ecastor:** 83n.

612 ferantur: generic subjunc. Laches urges haste. Cf. *Hau.* 240, where Clinia, knowing the *mores mulierum*, observes *dum moliantur, dum conantur, annus est*, ‘While they get ready, while they get going, a year passes.’ **dixi:** formal language (*translata de foro et causidicis*, Don.); cf. *Cic. Ver.* 1.56, *Lucil.* 282–3 (Marx), and the exchange at *Ph.* 437–9. Thus Sostrata’s acquiescent *ut iubes* in response.

The piper has played continuously since 516. This single *senarius* provides a moment’s respite (another, longer break comes for him at 623) and marks the end of Sostrata’s time onstage. She enters her house at this point and will not return,

a fact – like Myrrina's disappearance at 576 – with consequences for the play's interpretation. See Introduction 3.2.3.

613 abire matrem: understand *iubes* from 612. **minime:** a common negative in Pl. and T., but it does not entirely lose its superlative force (Thesleff 1960: 60–2). Pamphilus is quite alarmed at the possibility of her leaving, but of course he cannot say why. **istuc:** i.e. that she *not* move to the country.

614 etiam: 430n. Pamphilus has in fact been unambiguous in his refusal to take her back (403–4, 492–5, confirmed at 616). **quid sim facturus:** the notional question in direct speech contained a potential subjunc., i.e. *quid faciam?* To preserve that nuance in reported form, Latin employs a periphrastic subjunc. made of the fut. part. and the appropriate form of *sim* (NLS §183).

615 equidem: emphatic, not adversative (Solodow 1978: 104). **contineor:** sc. *quin redducam*. The form is really an inflexive middle, e.g. Pl. *Cas.* 239 *uix teneor quin dicam* 'I can barely keep myself from speaking' (Weiss 2009: 380–1).

616 minuat 'modify' (OLD 4b). **ex usu:** 548n. Since Pamphilus' response to Laches' question only comes at 617, these two lines must be spoken aside, a reminder to the audience of his inner struggle between love and propriety.

617 ea gratia 'for this reason' (OLD 7c); cf. *An.* 433 *ea me hic restitisse gratia* 'that's the reason I've stayed here'. The phrase anticipates the *si*-clause. **concordes . . . fore:** working from the conventional resumption of hostility between *socrus* and *nurus* (201, 277), Pamphilus hopes that the end of proximity will lead to the end of hostility.

618 nescias 'you never can tell', a potential subjunc. in a general statement (58n.). **id** anticipates *utrum . . . fecerint*. **tua refert nil** 'it makes no difference to you'. The verb, whether impersonal or with a neut. pron. subj., is often constructed with an abl. fem. pron. agreeing with the *re* of *refert* (NLS §213). Cf. Pl. *Cas.* 320 *quid id refert tua?* 'What's that to you?', T. *Eun.* 320 *mea nil refert dum potiar modo*, 'It makes no difference to me so long as I get possession.' **utrum:** *utrum concordēs sint anne discordēs* (Don.).

619 haec: sc. Sostrata. **aberit:** fut. indic. in the causal clause, as commonly in Pl. and T. (477n.). **aetas** 'time of life' (OLD 2a), in this case old age. Tension between generations may lie behind the Roman proverbial expression *sexagenarios per pontem mittendos* (Varro ap. Non. 842L), but the expression was poorly understood even in antiquity (Parkin 2003: 265–72). Some hint of bitterness or rivalry may linger in the diminutive *adulescentulis*.

620 e medio 'out of the way' (OLD 3b). It is a euphemism for death at *Ph.* 967 and 1019, and though *rus* is Laches' literal meaning, that overtone may also be heard here. Cf. 596 (Sostrata speaking).

620–1 ‘In the end, Pamphilus, we are the old man and the old woman of the story.’ Laches seems to refer to a familiar tale (or play), but what it was and what it meant to the audience are beyond recall. The metrical shift at 621 may create some small emphasis (Denzler 1970: 67–8). Don. recalled headings like ‘Vulpis et aquila’ and ‘Scurra et rusticus’ introducing the fables of Phaedrus, which is why modern editors commonly put *senex atque anus* in quotation marks, but Don. himself found the reference ‘obscure’ (ἄμυρρά). There may be self-deprecation in the terms *senex* and *anus* (cf. the bucolic harmony of Ovid’s Philemon and Baucis, *Met.* 8.624–724) or something more ironic. The reference is in any case not purely Roman, e.g. an allusion to the domestic struggles of a contemporary street mime. A MS of Don. unknown to Wessner, his Teubner editor, preserves a garbled version of T.’s original that, as restored, is almost identical to his text: <τὸ πέρασ δὲ> μῦθος ἔσμεν ἤδη, Πάμφιλε, | γραῦς <καὶ> γέρων (*PCG*, fr. 13; cf. Warren 1906). For colloquial τὸ πέρασ ‘in a nutshell’, cf. *Men. Dys.* 117, *Epit.* 287. Understanding *postremo fabulae sumus* ‘we are at the end of the story [sc. of life]’, as suggested by Scarpat 1996, is not a likely construction for *postremo* ‘in the end’ (*OLD* 3) or ‘in short’ (*OLD* 4). We would expect *finis*, e.g. 96 *finem* . . . *orationi*, *An.* 821 *orandi iam finem fac*.

622 per tempus: opportune (Don.). Entrance lines of this kind are a comic staple (Duckworth 1952: 114–15). **accedamus:** Laches and Pamphilus had been conversing downstage (607 n.). They now turn toward Phidippus’ house, though Pamphilus hangs back as Laches approaches his neighbour.

IV.iv: Phidippus, Laches, Pamphilus (622–726)

Phidippus enters, speaking back through the door as at 243, both times scolding his (unseen) daughter. He is not prone to speak so strongly to the formidable Myrrina. The coming dialogue further complicates Pamphilus’ dilemma, but Laches’ logical, though erroneous, assumption about his continued refusal to take back his wife will inadvertently set in motion the play’s resolution.

The single line of dimeter at 621 began a modulation to iambic rhythm that quickly leads to this extended scene in senarii. The tibicen is now silent.

624 quidem: the adv. extends its emphasis to the entire sentence (Solodow 1978: 98–103). Phidippus’ string of emphaziers, *quoque edepol* . . . *quidem* . . . *hercle* is noteworthy. He is, of course, better at bluster than at getting his way. **factumst . . . turpiter:** the act, as soon becomes clear, is not the departure from her husband’s house (the issue at 243) or even the pregnancy alone, but the fact that she kept pregnancy and birth secret.

625 causa ‘excuse’ (*OLD* 5). Cf. *Ph.* 234 *quam causam reperient?* ‘what excuse will they find?’ Laches, too, will presume Myrrina’s responsibility (660–1).

626 nulla: sc. *causa*. Laches now catches his neighbour’s attention.

628 hoc: the continued (and now seemingly illogical) refusal, given Sostrata's self-imposed exile, to take back his wife. **aperiam:** fut. indic. (516n.). This is the first in a series of asides as Pamphilus begins commenting to the audience on what the old men are saying. The effect is to create two parallel, simultaneous conversations, Pamphilus presumably closer to the audience and the two fathers closer to the house door. He will ignore their appeals until 655. Cf. Bain 1977: 162–8 and Marshall 2006: 166–7 on 'split-focus scenes'.

629 concessurum 'will retire' (*OLD* 1), but retaining some connotation of 'will defer' (*OLD* 4). Lindsay found this reading in an early glossary and put it in his OCT. For the fut. act. part. as an indeclinable neuter in the fut. inf., see Gell. 1.7 defending Cic. *Verr.* 5.167 *hanc sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum*. The extant MSS of T. all read *-am*, which most editors retain.

630 ne reuereatur: neg. command and purpose can be difficult to distinguish, as at *Ad.* 113 *ausculta, ne me optundas* . . . A clause of prevention follows, where *minus iam quo* = *quominus*. Laches' language continues to have significant overtones: *reuereor* suggests both hesitation and deference, and *domus* means both their house (which it continues to be throughout) and her home (which it has *not* been).

631 commeruit: the verb regularly refers to guilt, not reward in comedy (*OLD* 2). **tua:** sc. uxor.

632 Myrrina . . . mea uxore: the mild hyperbaton lends irony to *uxore* and creates the jingle *uxore exorta*, a prized effect in comic diction.

633 mutatio fit! 'That's a change!' (Barsby). This is the first Pamphilus has heard of blame shifting from Sostrata to Myrrina. The comment, another in the long series of asides that make the audience privy to his thoughts – and may encourage identification with his perspective – is attributed to Phidippus in the MSS. The mysterious ancient corrector Iovialis saw the need to divide the line, but Richard Bentley was the first modern editor to argue for this change of attribution and put it in his text. **ea:** Myrrina. Pamphilus' comment has gone unnoticed. **perturbat:** an unwitting correction of Laches' charge at 213.

634 dum 'so long as'. The subjunc. indicates a wish, not a fact (*NLS* §220). **porro:** soon. Pamphilus' cavalier, unfeeling joke prefigures the callousness with which he accepts the sacrifice of others for his sake. See 865–7n.

635 Pamphile: Phidippus' attempt to draw Pamphilus into the conversation is unsuccessful. **potest:** T. observes no firm rule for the mood of subordinate clauses in reported speech (*NLS* §286). Contrast *An.* 341 *quem ego nunc credo, si iam audierit, me quaerere*. The proviso suggests an appropriate diffidence on Phidippus' part since Myrrina's purported fault puts him in the wrong.

637 sin est ut: 501n. Echo of that scene may well be deliberate on T.'s part.

638 accipias: the subjunc., more like a suggestion than a command, is often preferred to the imperative in colloquial Latin (Palmer 1961: 310). In cases of

divorce, Roman children normally remained with the father's family to be raised by father or grandparents as appropriate (Treggiari 1991: 445, 467–8). **puerum**: Phidippus casually drops the bombshell that destroys Pamphilus' hope of emerging unscathed from this exchange.

639 nobis: Phidippus embraces both families with his news, as Laches' response makes clear (642).

640 abducta . . . fuerat: adj. + verb, the part. representing a state (*MLS* §100). Other seemingly irregular collocations occur at *An.* 213, *Eu.* 280, and below 777. The verb suggests not just unwilling transfer but reversal of the marriage rite. Cf. 135 *uxorem deducit domum*. Criticism of Myrrina is implicit in the language.

642 gaudeo: T.'s old men, even harsh ones like Demea of *Ad.*, consistently show care and even affection for children (Duckworth 1952: 243–5).

643 quid mulieris 'what kind of woman'. *qualem mulierem* would be neutral; the partitive gen. has a neg. connotation, as *Eu.* 546 and 833 *quid hominis* (so Don.). As at 249, Laches cannot resist a negative comment even at a positive moment.

644 uxorem: predicative. **moratam**: the adjectival form of *mos* makes possible the figura etymologica *moratam moribus*. Cf. the similarly negative connotation of *mores* at 478 above. The abl. is descriptive, e.g. Pl. *Capt.* 105–7 *antiquis est adulescens moribus . . . condigne pater est eius moratus moribus*.

645 celatos: sc. *esse*. Exclamatory inf. For the double acc., 320n. **hoc**: the pregnancy.

646 quam 'how', to be taken closely with *prae*, displaced to create the alliterative ending. **proloqui** 'put into words', the complement to *nequeo*.

648 dudum 'for a long time' (*OLD* 2). The perf. might seem a more appropriate tense for a belief continuing into the pres., but pluperf. appears at *Hau.* 786, *Ph.* 914. The substitution is not uncommon (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 224–5). **hoc**: i.e. 'what to do', a different referent from Laches' preceding *hoc*. The imprecision suggests colloquial speech.

649 non est: sc. *ambiguom*. **quom**: 230n. **alienus puer** 'another man's child'. As at 476, T.'s suppression of an expository prologue deprives the line of the irony its Greek prototype probably carried. The effectiveness of that decision and the surprise it means to create with the eventual revelation at 818 have long been debated by the play's critics (e.g. Norwood 1923: 103–5, Goldberg 1986: 159–62).

650 hic (adv.) 'in the present circumstances' (*OLD* 5). **consultatio** 'an opportunity for debate' (*OLD* 1b). The verbal noun + *est* also substitutes for a verb at *An.* 400, *Eu.* 671, *Ph.* 293, *Ad.* 421.

651 uidere . . . optabamus: *opto* + inf. seems colloquial but is found in Latin of all registers. Cf. Catul. 76.25 *ipse ualere opto et taetrum hunc deponere morbum*.

652 ex te . . . te: the artificiality of Pamphilus' bracketed asides, both clichés of comic distress (*perii, nullus sum*), is accentuated by Laches' direct address to his son. As at 638, it is not just the aside that goes unnoticed by the speaker, but the very time it takes to speak it.

654 redduc . . . noli aduorsari: the imperatives are peremptory, as suits Laches' dictatorial temperament. His *potestas* is more convincingly manifest than Phidippus'.

655 si . . . uellet: use of the imperf. subjunc. to represent a pres. unreal state established itself in the period between T. and Pl., who more often uses the pres. subjunc. in such cases, e.g. *As.* 393 *si sit domi, dicam tibi*, 'If he were home, I'd tell you' (*SEL* 1.278–9, *NLS* §197).

657 clam: prep. + acc. **celasse:** Pamphilus is running out of excuses. His one remaining option, save for telling the truth (which he promised Myrrina not to do, 402), is to build on Laches' annoyance about the secret pregnancy (645) by taking it as a sign of alienation. Phidippus should know better (268–9), but having blamed Myrrina for everything, he has taken himself out of the argument.

658 alienum . . . animum: i.e. 'estranged'; cf. 158, *Ad.* 338 *illum alieno animo a nobis esse res ipsa indicat*, 'The facts themselves show that he is estranged from us.'

659 conuenturum: sc. *esse*. Impersonal, as at 178.

661 adulescens mulier: the adjectival use of nouns is rare in T. and has various effects. *Ph.* 292 *seruom hominem causam orare leges non sinunt* is probably mere padding, since *seruom* alone makes the required point (generalized *homo* is readily used of slaves, e.g. *An.* 769, 778; *Hau.* 313, 530); *Eu.* 357 *senem mulierem* 'that woman of a man' (Barsby) is clearly pejorative. The anger at *Eu.* 857 *uirginem utiari ciuem* suggests hendiadys, e.g. 'a virgin and a citizen'. So here, two circumstances led to Philumena's malleability, viz. that she is young and that she is a (mere) woman.

662 censen: 78n. The conversational use often connotes, as here, mistaken belief (*OLD* 2). **ullam mulierem:** Laches moves easily between specific targets and a more general misogyny, each prejudice reinforcing the other. That tendency was established on first acquaintance (198) and remains unchanged throughout the play.

663 careat: generic subjunc. **quia:** Laches' alternative explanation is ironic (*OLD* 2d). The weakness, he implies, is so pervasive that even men suffer from it. **delincunt:** the archaic spelling (classical *delinquant*) found in the ancient Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (A) is retained by editors.

664 uidete: Phidippus' (impatient) interruption drives his neighbours from the relatively harmless task of affixing blame to the central question about the child (668), which has been his concern from the beginning (638, 639, 647).

665 remissan . . . reductan: *ne – ne* is unparalleled in T. for an indirect alternative question: the expected construction is *ne – an* or *an* alone. **uobis:** emphatic. Whether they send Philumena back or keep her as a wife makes no difference to Phidippus, as he confirms at 667.

666 in manu: 493n. Phidippus, from the strictly legal perspective, has this control over his womenfolk, but he is too well versed in his own limitations to think he could exercise it (cf. 270). This is true whether the *uxor* referred to is Myrrina or Philumena. The dramatic situation favours the former, but the immediate context might suggest the latter, since they have been talking about Philumena. *mea* is on either interpretation (*pace* Don.) abl.

668 puero: instrumental abl., as at *Hau.* 317 *quid illo facias?* ‘What could you do with him?’ and often. The sex of the child is not being specified: *puer* is generic for ‘baby’ in comedy (*pro quolibet sexu*, Don. ad *An.* 400), e.g. *An.* 486, 833, though this one is apparently a boy (*filium*, 832).

669 quidquid futurumst: i.e. concerning Philumena. Laches, to his son’s dismay, is willing to separate the problem of the marriage from the problem of the child.

670 nostrum ‘as our own’ (predicative). For the child’s status, 638n.

671 ego alam? Pamphilus’ reluctance to accept the child sounds more Greek than Roman: 387n. Laches’ immediate echo of these words (*an non alemus?*) shows that he has caught only this last part of the aside. The overheard aside is sometimes played for laughs (e.g. *Hau.* 200 *quid tute tecum?* ‘What are you saying to yourself?’), but here it adds an emotional charge. Had Laches heard the first part of Pamphilus’ remark, his response might have taken a very different direction. For the dramatic possibilities of overheard asides, see Bain 1977: 156–8. The success of this and related conventions depends not on how ‘realistic’ they are but on how well the dramatist exploits their artificiality. Duckworth 1952: 111–12 misses the point in praising T. for escaping ‘the danger of improbability’. **eho:** 100n.

672 quaeso: 588n. **amentia:** an analogous situation is described at *Hau.* 633–43, where Chremes berates his wife for having given their unwanted child to a neighbour to rear.

673 enimvero prorsus iam: a remarkable collocation, as befits Laches’ extreme annoyance. *enimvero* ‘really’ (*Hau.* 320 *enimvero reticere nequeo*); *prorsus* ‘absolutely’ (*Eu.* 306 *ita prorsum oblitus sum mei*); *iam* ‘now’ (*An.* 821 *orandi iam finem face*).

674 cogis ut . . . loquar: the construction is as common in T. as acc. + inf. **nolo:** sc. *loqui*. Indic. since a subjunc. might be mistaken for potentiality. Pamphilus’ rejection of wife and child suggests a rejection of family life that will lead Laches to one last, perhaps inevitable explanation of his son’s attitude.

675 tuarum lacrumarum: gen. with *ignarum*. The tears need not be literal. They are readily evoked as a symbol of great distress, which is how *An.* 126 *hinc illae lacrumae* became proverbial (e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 61, Hor. *Ep.* 1.19.41).

676 id quod: 368n. **sollicitare** = *perturberis* (Don.). *sollicito*, both act. and pass., is used exclusively of mental states in T. (*OLD* 3).

677 primum: correlated with *nunc* (680). Laches reviews the collapse of Pamphilus' excuses, both rhetorically effective in context and a convenient reminder to the audience of how and why he has so entangled himself in this predicament.

680 quoque: best taken with *nunc* (*OLD* 4c), since there has been only one *causa* defined so far.

681 alteram: sc. *causam*.

682 tui animi ignarum: at 675, Laches claims specific knowledge of what he least knows, though action motivated by his ignorance will unwittingly solve Pamphilus' dilemma. For the irony here, see 867n.

683 aliquando tandem 'sometime, finally'. **huc:** i.e. *ad nuptias*. **animum ut adiungas:** the phrase in T. occurs only here and *An.* 56 *ut animum ad aliquod studium adiungant*. It is synonymous with *animum adducere* (689, 836). The purpose clause depends on *spatium*.

684 longum spatium: 555n. Laches' self-described forbearance is consistent with the accounts of Parmeno (114–24) and Pamphilus (294–8), though naturally from a different perspective. **amandi amicam:** gerund + acc. obj. appears regularly in comedy, though gerundive constructions become the norm in T., e.g. *Ph.* 828 *tempus conueniundi patris* (*NLS* §206). For *amicam*, see 541n.

686 egi atque oraui tecum: *orare cum*, common in Pl., appears only here in T. and may be archaic by his time. For the sentiment, cf. Parmeno, *ut ducat orare occipit* (116), but then *acrius pater instat* (120–1).

687 Laches expressed a different view at 242. He has, in a very human way, recast his memory of the past to suit the needs of the present.

688 obsecutus: constructed with acc. of the action and dat. of its instigator.

686 nunc . . . induxti: perf. for an action undertaken in the past but continuing into the pres.

690 quoi: sc. *meretrici*. **huic:** sc. *uxori* (with a gesture toward the house). In addition to this emphatic opposition, the close structural parallel with 688 makes the pointed contrast between *mihi* and *quoi*, *ut decuerat* and *iniuriam*. Contrast Laches on *iniuria* in these lines with Philotis and Syra, introducing the same idea from a different perspective (70–2).

691 uitam ‘way of life’ (*OLD* 7c). A euphemism no doubt motivated by Phidippus’ presence. **reuolutum** ‘relapse’ (*OLD* 4a), *tamquam inuitum aut nescium* (Don.), and if so, another deliberately mild version of what the normally blunt Laches would otherwise be inclined to say.

692 mene? The case answers *te* of 691. Pamphilus is amazed: his father’s logic has escaped him. Laches’ error lies not in the deduction itself but in assuming rather than testing the truth of it.

693 confingis: the verb often implies deceit, e.g. *Ad.* 558 *lacrumae confictae dolis*, *Pl. Capt.* 35, 47 *hunc confinxerunt dolum*. **ad:** purpose (*OLD* 41), e.g. *Hau.* 481 *quantam fenestram ad nequitiam patefeceris!* ‘What a window you’ll have opened for extravagance!’

694 cum illa uiuis: living with a *meretrix* is more serious a moral offence than simply patronizing one (Don.). Cf. Demea’s incredulous horror at the prospect of taking in Ctesipho’s *psaltria* at *Ad.* 747 *meretrix et materalibus una in domo?* **testem hanc:** sc. Philumena. One suspicion builds on another: Pamphilus, he now thinks, has contrived this quarrel to remove his wife as a witness to his depravity.

695 adeo ‘furthermore’ (*OLD* 6b).

696 diuinat: Don. quotes a proverb, *aiunt diuinare sapientem*. Phidippus quickly seizes on an explanation that puts all blame on Pamphilus. The 3rd pers. verb shows that his words are spoken aside.

697 iusiurandum: an oath, as Don. notes, is the refuge of a litigant who lacks either an effective argument or supporting evidence; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 5.6. **nil . . . istorum** ‘none of these things’. **ah:** the particle strengthens the rejoinder, e.g. *An.* 972 *ah, desine!*, *Ad.* 112 *ah, ascolta*.

698 cedo: 458n.

699 tempus ‘the appropriate time’ (*OLD* 8). An all-purpose excuse since Pamphilus cannot imagine such a time. His promise to Myrrina (402) compels his silence. **accipias:** the 2nd pers. subjunc., always less peremptory than the imper., suggests a change of tack. In the face of Pamphilus’ pointblank refusal, Laches adopts a gentler tone to plead on behalf of the innocent victim.

700 in culpa: the phrase does the work of an adj., like *in tuto* (*Hau.* 695, *Ph.* 734), *in tranquillo* (*Eu.* 1038). There is some irony here since the child is, if not to blame for the problem, at least its immediate cause. **post** ‘later’ (*OLD* 2). **uidero** ‘I’ll see to it’, as at *An.* 456, *Ad.* 538. The aoristic fut. in this idiom suggests deferred action. Cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 2.33 *sed de me uidero. nunc hoc propono . . .* ‘I will see about myself later. For now, I propose this . . .’ (Ernout-Thomas 1959: 251–2).

701-5 A very long aside in a scene that has consistently exploited asides to play the mounting awkwardness and emotional tension of Pamphilus' dilemma off against the artificiality of the comic situation. The conventional problem produces strikingly realistic responses true both to events and to the personalities involved. Pamphilus' immediate problem here is much more complex than that of Moschion in Menander's *Samia*, who must avoid an analogous revelation before his girl's father but will at least be able to speak the truth to his own (*Sam.* 488-530).

702 rebus: the 'matters' in question are the combination of Laches' accusations and proposals. **concludit** 'hems in' (*OLD* 1e). Don. heard an allusion to hunting; cf. Pl. *Rud.* 610 (of a monkey) *concludo in uinclā bestiam nequissimam*.

703 abibo hinc: as at 495, Pamphilus responds to a difficult situation by running away from it. His ultimate flight from responsibility will be a variant of this pattern of behaviour. See 868n. **promoueo** 'accomplish' (*OLD* 5a).

704 credo: the combination of parenthetic comment and caesura puts appropriate emphasis on *iniussu*. The internal rhyme *credo-meo* is also noteworthy. **non tollent:** 571n.

705 adiutrix: Myrrina had promised to have the child exposed (400). Pamphilus' sequence of thought, natural in itself, is also a timely reminder to the audience just as the rapidly complicating situation is about to take another significant turn. As at 677, T. works unobtrusively to keep the entire problem in view.

706 fugis? Spoken to Pamphilus' departing figure. Since the following action will show that Pamphilus is not in the house, his exit here must be to one of the wings. His return with Parmeno at 841 is clearly from offstage. **hem:** 205n. **quicquam certi:** 97n.

707 tibi: with Pamphilus gone, Laches turns to Phidippus. **apud sese** 'in his right mind' (*OLD* 11); cf. *An.* 408, *Ph.* 204. **sine** 'Never mind!' (*OLD* 2), a common colloquialism, e.g. Pl. *Per.* 688 *sine, quaeso*, *St.* 95 *sine, pater* (Hofmann 1951: 39).

708 cedo: 458n. **maxume:** ready, even submissive agreement (Thesleff 1960: 44-5). For the child in this situation, see 638n.

710 amarae mulieres: there are strong-willed women in T. (e.g. Nausistrata of *Ph.*), but Myrrina is hardly one of them.

711 ipsa narravit: if the reference is to the opinion reported at 537-9, Phidippus at best exaggerates his wife's opposition to the marriage. He consistently adjusts his opinions and his memory to present conditions.

712 hoc praesente: Pamphilus.

713 illi: sc. *Myrrinae*. Phidippus' initial tolerance of Pamphilus' past behaviour was signalled at 552-3.

714 abhorrere . . . a nuptiis: Phidippus naturally assumes that the opposition is not to his daughter but to the very idea of marriage (Don.). As at *An.* 829 *abhorrenti ab re uxoria*, the young man's motives and desires are completely misunderstood by the older generation. Comic convention characterizes marriage as the goal of youth and the bane of age (Duckworth 1952: 281–5).

715–18 Laches has never yet asked for advice. Having him do so here allows T. to motivate and set expectations as naturally as possible for the coming confrontation with Bacchis.

717 grauius: with *minitemur*. Caesura in the fourth foot and enjambment emphasize this last element of the tricolon.

718 minitemur si . . . habuerit: the *si*-clause reports the notional threat, its perf. subjunc. representing a fut. perf. indic. in what would have been the direct statement.

719 eho 'Hey!', common before a voc. or an imper. to attract attention (Müller 1997: 105–6). **puer <e>:** the archaic voc., common in Pl., does not appear in any MSS of T., but metre requires it here and at *Eu.* 624.

A slave now appears from Laches' doorway to receive these instructions, runs across to Bacchis' house, and is admitted while Laches resumes his conversation with Phidippus at 721. There must therefore be some small pause in the line between its voc. and imper. and significant stage business between 721 and 727. Supernumerary roles of this type are fairly frequent in comedy (Prescott 1936: 108).

720 uerbis meis 'in my name' (*OLD* 14); cf. Pl. *Am.* 967–8 *huc euoca uerbis meis Blepharorem*.

721 oro . . . sis: Pl. and T. readily construct verbs of requesting like *oro* with or without *ut*, e.g. *An.* 556 *id te oro ut ante eamus* and would probably not have paused to consider whether *sis* is subordinate or paratactic (*SEL* I. 217–18). **porro** 'hereafter' (*OLD* 2).

723 manere adfinitatem repeats Phidippus' declaration at 635–6. His claims of indifference at 508–9 and 664–7 were never very convincing.

724 ut possit: sc. *manere*. For the construction, 501n.

725 uin = *uisne*. Phidippus echoes the *numquid uis?* formula of polite leave-taking (272n.). His desire to withdraw is both psychologically plausible (the coming interview might well be awkward for Pamphilus' father-in-law) and dramatically desirable, since Laches is a more potent figure than his malleable neighbour. **istam:** deliberately pejorative (*OLD* 5b); cf. *meretricem* (716), which Laches answers merely with the neutral *uicinam* (720).

726 para 'hire' (*OLD* 4).

Vi: Bacchis, Laches (727–67)

Bacchis enters from her house, accompanied by two maids (*ambae*, 793), a familiar entourage for professionals of her standing (*Hau.* 245–6, *Eu.* 506, with Prescott 1936: 111–12). The slave sent to fetch her may also be in attendance. The actual encounter with Laches is delayed by parallel asides (727–8, 729–30) and then proceeds in a strikingly formal, polite way: Laches treats her with greater consideration than he shows his own wife. Yet Bacchis' character remains a cipher. Parmeno called her *maligna* and *procax* (159), i.e. the *meretrix mala* of comic stereotype, and Pamphilus said little to suggest otherwise (295–8). Philotis and Syra, however, long since alerted us to the possibility of an alternative view, and Bacchis herself recognizes the prejudice her occupation arouses (734–5). Scholarly opinion is correspondingly mixed, ranging from the adoring ('one of the noblest, most authentic, most loveable characters in Roman literature,' Norwood 1923: 145) to the cynical ('a splendid example of a braggart, swaggering prostitute,' Gilula 1980: 160). As often with T., critical response says as much about the critic as about the text.

The act break placed before this scene by modern editors is quite artificial since the action is continuous. An empty stage, the most common indication of an original Greek act division left by Roman dramatists, does not occur until 798, though no lapse of time is dramatically necessary at that point. Those who place Apollodorus' act break after 726 must posit major reworking of the stage geography by T. to provide an appropriate interval between the summoning of Bacchis at 720 and her appearance at 727 (e.g. Lowe 1983: 448–51).

The dramatic impact of the scene is heightened by the return of musical accompaniment, which begins immediately upon Phidippus' exit at 726 and will continue until the end of the play. In this scene, the musical effects are especially marked. The two asides with which it begins are metrically equivalent, with the actual start of the encounter signalled by a single dimeter line (731). The scene then continues in iambic and trochaic rhythms throughout, shifting frequently between them and employing lines of different lengths.

727 non hoc de nihilo: a reinforced negative is colloquial (Palmer 1961: 75–6, Bagordo 2001: 73–5). **quod:** 368n. **conuentam esse expetit:** 563n. *conuenio* eventually developed a sexual connotation, perhaps as early as Lucr. 2.922 *inter sese ullam rem gignere conueniundo*, explicitly at Plin. *Nat.* 11.85 (copulating spiders), and by implication at Apul. *Met.* 4.27 *in uoluptatem ueneriam conuenire*, but in comedy it invariably means simply 'to meet' or impersonally 'to suit'. A double *entendre* is therefore unlikely here. Though Bacchis has had no contact with Pamphilus for some months, Laches' concern is not difficult to guess: her willingness to meet him is already a sign of her good will.

728 multum: adv. **quin . . . uelit:** i.e. *quin quod uelit hoc sit quod suspicor* (Don.), where *quin* governs *sit*, *quod uelit* is a generic clause, and *quod suspicor* is

in apposition to *quod uelit*. Bacchis is shrewd enough to guess what is on Laches' mind.

729 minus: answered by *quam*, as 647 *non tibi...minus placet quam mihi*. **propter iram:** the phrase recalls the *iratus senex* of comic stereotype (e.g. *Hau.* 37). Don. ad 727 notes that both Bacchis, as *bona meretrix*, and Laches, as *mitis senex*, act here against type – but not innocently so. Their asides show each in the process of selecting an advantageous posture. **hinc:** from Bacchis. This is Bentley's correction of MSS *hanc*, which is ungrammatical if referring to Bacchis and pointless if taken with *iram*. **possi<e>m:** the archaic subjunc. is required by the metre. See 145n.

730 post: adv. **quod...me minus fecisse:** the clause answers *quid faciam plus*. Laches does not want to do more when it would be better to do less.

731 adgrediar: Laches, standing by his house door, must advance downstage and centre to speak with Bacchis, who simultaneously makes a similar approach from her side of the stage. T. takes seriously a type scene Pl. often plays for laughs, e.g. *Bac.* 530–6, *Epid.* 526–48. Further variants are discussed by Marshall 1999: 120–4. **salue:** a polite, if reserved greeting (Müller 1997: 22–3). The single short iambic line emphasizes the modulation to direct address (Bruder 1970: 18).

733 quid sit quapropter: the pleonasm is colloquial, if uncharacteristic of the normally forceful and blunt Laches. He is speaking carefully. **te:** obj. of *euocare*. **iussi:** 273n.

734 quoque: sc. *miror*. **etiam timida:** though legally free and entrepreneurial, a *meretrix* in Bacchis' position depended on the goodwill of her clientele and could be vulnerable to the hostility of a well-connected neighbour. So T.'s comparably independent Thais is anxious to secure the *beneficium* of an influential patron (*Eu.* 147–9). Bacchis must therefore treat Laches' approach with care, and so her deference here is not without calculation (Müller 1997: 142–3). For the status of *hetairai* in Athens, see Davidson 1997: 120–7, and for their comic instantiations, Henry 1985, Hunter 1985: 92–5.

735 nomen mihi quaesti 'the reputation of my profession'. Though *quaestus* is a fourth declension noun, the inevitable confusion with second-declensional patterns can produce a genitive in *-i*. See 356n. T. reserves the word for the professions of parasite (*Eu.* 246, 253) and courtesan (*An.* 79, *Hau.* 640, *Ad.* 296). Like Thais (*Eu.* 197–8), but also like Sostrata (277–8), Bacchis struggles to escape the stereotyped view of her class and situation. **tutor** 'defend'. Early Latin readily substitutes pres. for fut. (*SEL* 1. 18–21).

736 nil...pericli: what 'danger' might Bacchis face? Legal trouble would be the most immediate threat, and *periculum* often connotes legal risk, e.g. *Ad.* 240 *potius quam uenias in periculum*, *Sannio*, when the pimp threatens to sue for his rights.

mulier: not so much pejorative (as 214) as a reminder of the difference in power between a respectable male citizen like Laches and a *meretrix*.

737 aetate ea ‘of such an age’ (descriptive abl.). Laches is mindful of the fact that old men in comedy, whether as lovers or assistants or obstacles to romance, rarely come off well in dealings with *meretrices*. Good survey of the possibilities in Duckworth 1952: 242–9. **peccato mi ignosci** ‘to forgive me for a mistake’. The meaning is clearer than the syntax. T. does not elsewhere construct *ignosco* with dat. of person and thing. *peccato* is more likely an abl. of attendant circumstance, lit. ‘when a wrong has been done’. cf. Cic. *Agr.* 2.5 *mihi... errato nulla uenia, recte facto exigua laus* ‘no pardon for me if I err, meagre praise if it is done well’.

738 magis: commonly taken with *cautius*, a common pleonasm (*OLD* 2c), but word order might encourage reading *quo magis*, as *An.* 308, *Ph.* 104, 328, 878, *Ad.* 680. The difference is more of emphasis than substance.

739 facturae es: the periphrastic fut. indicates intention, as *Ph.* 833 *quidnam nunc facturust Phaedria?*, *Pl. Bac.* 716 *quid es facturust?* **bonas:** the subj. of *facere*, thrust forward for emphasis. The pl. is generic, ‘respectable women’.

740 inscitum: sc. *me*, subj. of the inf. clause. **offerre:** properly, says Don., the verb for doing undeserved injury. The verb for earned *iniuria* is *reddere*.

741–2 Laches managed to be simultaneously polite and condescending, masking his implicit threat in circumlocution. Bacchis responds with self-effacing irony.

741 Bacchis expands the *gratias tibi habeo* idiom with ironic effect. The mild tmesis of *magna ecaster gratia* and the generic relative combine for a certain emphasis. *brevis in longo* is common at the diaeresis in an iambic septenarius.

742 se expurget ‘excuses himself’ (*OLD* 3). **parum mi prosit:** the self-deprecatory potential subjunc. wraps implicit mockery in scrupulous politeness. The *leno* Sannio offers a cruder, dismissive version of the same idea at *Ad.* 162–3.

743 Pleasantries over, Bacchis insists they come to the point. **receptas:** a frequentative form of *recipio* (*OLD* 2). Laches, true to his natural style, phrases his claim as an accusation. **ah:** Bacchis tries to interrupt – Laches’ misrepresentation should not go unchallenged – but is waved into silence.

744 sine dicam ‘let me speak!’, i.e. *sine [ut] dicam*. T. often omits *ut*, e.g. *Hau.* 1050 and *Eu.* 185 *sine te exorem*. Laches’ words could, however, be understood in parataxis: *sine!* ‘Don’t interrupt!’ silencing Bacchis (like *mane!* below), followed by assertive *dicam* ‘I’ll speak (first).’ The underlying interpretive issue is of characterization, not syntax. **amorem** ‘affair’ (*OLD* 2). Cf. *An.* 913 *meretricios amores nuptiis conglutinas?* ‘Cementing love affairs with the glue of marriage?’ (Barsby) **pertuli:** a true statement in a sea of presumption; cf. 684n.

745 mane: Laches forestalls another attempted interruption. The line is metrically unusual, a good example of rhythm manipulated for dramatic effect. Diaeresis is the norm after the fourth foot of a trochaic septenarius. What is instead a delayed caesura combines with metrical hiatus to put a very strong pause at the syntactic boundary and thus special emphasis on the central fact, *hic nunc uxorem habet*.

746 firmiorem ‘more lasting’ (*OLD* 9); cf. *firmiorem amicitiam* (533). Laches presumes that the marriage will eventually end Pamphilus’ desire (or ability) to continue the affair.

747 hoc animo ‘of this disposition’ (*OLD* 9c). Laches believes Pamphilus is still infatuated with Bacchis. **aetatem** ‘all his life’ (acc. of duration); cf. *Hau.* 716 *me aetatem censes uelle id assimularier?* ‘Do you think I want to keep pretending this for the rest of my life?’ **eadem istac aetate** ‘this same age’, alluding to the fact that Bacchis’ current charms (*aetas in flore . . . facies uendibilis*, Don.), and thus her ability to attract patrons, will not last for ever. Laches phrases a demand as a suggestion.

748 Bacchis, disinclined to take advice from Laches, responds not to his suggestion but to the implicit accusation behind it. **ait:** the verb, says Don., has a dismissive connotation (*sic dicimus ‘ait’ ‘aio’ de rebus nugatoriis*). Her question implies a refutation. **socrus:** Myrrina has made no such accusation, though Phidippus readily attributed her dismay to Pamphilus’ problematic loyalties (709–11). Laches invokes an external authority for his own conjecture, though by now he probably thinks he is speaking the truth. **men** = *me* + *ne*, the subj. of an inf. clause, *me Pamphilum recepitasse*, understood from *id*. The ellipsis captures the rapid exchange of actual conversation, as often in T, e.g. *Ph.* 447–9 (further exx. in Palmer 1961: 90–1). **abduxit:** sc. Myrrina.

749 clam . . . exstinguere: Myrrina said only *exponetur* (400). The more colourful verb is calculated (and delayed) for emphasis to arouse Bacchis’ pity.

750 qui: abl. (527n.). **apud uos** ‘in your estimation’ (*OLD* 12); cf. *Ph.* 810 *itan paruum mihi fidem esse apud te?* ‘Do I have so little credibility in your eyes?’ **fidem** ‘credibility’ (*OLD* 9).

751 sanctius: the adv. modifies *firmare*, the point being that there is nothing more sacred than an oath. *fides* is not a trait associated with Bacchis’ profession: her earnestness reflects the ongoing difficulty of rising above stereotype. Cf. the exchange of Parmeno and Philotis, 108–14. **id:** the obj. anticipates the following inf. clause.

752 me . . . a me Pamphilum: the repetition and separation of *me* and *Pamphilum* are noteworthy. **habuisse:** 294n. **ut** ‘since’ (*OLD* 27). This may not be strictly true. Parmeno claimed that the relationship continued for a time after the marriage (157–9) and that Pamphilus, not Bacchis, eventually broke it off

(169–70). Each account works to the advantage of the narrator; as often in human affairs, ‘what really happened’ has become impossible to ascertain. Whether the discrepancy is inadvertent or a calculated clue to character is equally difficult to decide, though no subsequent development contradicts this seemingly favourable view of Bacchis, while Parmeno becomes a comic butt. Contrast Gilula 1980: 157–60, Lefèvre 1999: 53–4.

753 lepida ‘obliging’; cf. *An.* 948 after Simo yields to his son’s wishes: *o lepidum patrem!* The word, says Don., better suits a *meretrix* than a *mater*. **scin** = *scisne*. **sodes**: 358n. **cedo**: 458n.

754 ad mulieres: the expression seems calculated to recall what she shares with Myrrina and Philumena, not the social barrier between them. **iusiurandum**: the declaration of 752.

755 exple ‘assuage’ (*OLD* 3b), i.e. ‘set their minds at rest’, an unusual sense repeated at 785, 787. **is** = *eis* (dat.) **crimen**: the accusation of 743. Laches has moved from veiled warnings and a hectoring tone to something much more accommodating. What he now suggests is to the advantage of all, though he has no idea how extraordinarily advantageous it will turn out to be.

756 ex hoc quaestu: 735n. **scio**: parenthetic.

757 ut: the purpose clause that follows explains the preceding *quod*. **nuptae mulieri**: the natural antagonist of a *meretrix*. **ostenderet**: subj. is the hypothetical *alia* of 756. T. goes to some length here to distinguish Bacchis from conventional expectations of the *meretrix*.

758 esse: with *suspectum*. **falsa fama**: instr. abl.

759 leuiorem ‘irresponsible’ (*OLD* 15). The comparative acts as an intensifier (Ernout 1953: 74). **uiderier**: 104n.

760 inmerito: the emphatic placement sets up the jingle with *nam meritis*. Pamphilus has, in her view, acted responsibly in leaving her – and in staying away. **quod queam** ‘as much as I can’, a limiting rel. Such clauses are normally indicative in T., e.g. *Hau.* 416, *Ph.* 1050 *quod potero*, *Eu.* 215 *quod poteris*. The potential subjunc. appears in only three expressions, *quod sciam*, *quod nossem*, and *quod queam* (but *quod queo* at *Ad.* 423). **commodem** ‘help’ (*OLD* 4). Bacchis does not sound as *maligna et procax* as Parmeno had led us to expect (159). She is either dissembling to curry favour with Laches (Gilula 1980: 159–60) or Parmeno stands revealed as an unreliable source (Sewart 1974: 258).

761 facilem ‘accommodating’ (*OLD* 9), e.g. *Ad.* 986 *te isti facilem et festiuom putant* ‘they think you indulgent and genial’. **lingua tua** ‘your words’ (*OLD* 3). The expression is unparalleled in comedy. *Pl. Men.* 3 *adporto uobis Plautum – lingua, non manu* ‘I bring you Plautus – his words, not himself’ perhaps comes closest.

762 haec: fem. nom. pl. (101n.). This is probably said with a wave toward the house of Myrrina and Philumena. **ego quoque:** Laches conveniently forgets that he himself was the source of this mistaken belief (689).

763 quam: the grammatical antecedent is *eadem* in 764. **praeter nostram opinionem:** Bacchis seems to have won the battle against stereotype.

764 porro: 3oon. Laches is brusque even when generous. **utēre = ulēris.** The fut. implies a command, as at *Hau.* 833 *sequere hac me ocius*, ‘Follow me this way, and quickly.’ **amicitia** implies the granting of favours now that Laches has become *facilis benivolusque*. Cf. the pimp Sannio offering a bribe at *Ad.* 250–1 *scio te non usum antehac amicitia mea: memorem me dices esse et gratum*, ‘I know you’ve not yet enjoyed my friendship: you’ll say that I don’t forget and am grateful.’ Laches means not ‘friendship’ in the modern sense but ‘patronage’: Romans were inclined to say *amicus* (cf. 766) even when *cliens* was meant. See Saller 1989: 50–5.

765 Laches, for all his claims of goodwill, cannot resist one final threat, all the more menacing since it stands incomplete (aposiopesis). Phidippus had recommended a hard line (717–18), which comes naturally to Laches. **aegre** ‘causing distress’ (*OLD* 2). The full expression would be *ne audias quicquam ex me quod tibi aegre sit*.

766 quid possiem ‘what I am capable of’, sc. as friend or foe (cf. 729–30). Hendiadys (= *quid amicus potius quam inimicus possiem*) lends weight to the threat. The ind. quest. depend on *periculum facias* ‘put to the test’, i.e. ‘find out’. Don. found an echo of this passage in *Sal. Jug.* 32.5 *ne uim quam misericordiam eius experiri mallet*, less improbable than first appears since *periculum* is cognate with *experior*.

Vii: Bacchis, Laches, Phidippus (767–98)

Phidippus’ entrance from the wing with a nurse in tow (cf. 726) signals the start of a new scene in the MSS, but the action is continuous and the addition seamless as Phidippus quite independently completes the verse Laches began (cf. *Ad.* 81, 635, 958. Pl. does not introduce characters in mid-line.). He will not see Laches and Bacchis until 771. The stage at this point gets rather crowded: in addition to the three speaking parts, there are at least two attendants with Bacchis, probably Laches’ messenger returning home, and now the nurse. This is not as visually stunning a play as *Eunuchus*, with its parade of exotic gifts for Thais (469) and comic assault on her house (771) or *Adelphoe*, with the distinctive town and country looks of Micio and Demea, but even as calm a play as this can fill the stage with colourful display (cf. the porters with Parmeno at 409).

The scansion of line 769 only gradually reveals its iambic character, a hint of how the music modulates from trochaic to iambic rhythm, which it maintains until 798, where a corresponding modulation moves back to trochees.

767 apud me: the nurse has been brought for the baby (*puero nutricem para*, 726) and enters Phidippus' house at 770, but his generosity is largely for show since the baby is expected to move into the care of Laches' family (708).

768 defieri 'be lacking'. *defio* and *deficio* are interchangeable in Pl. and T., but *defio* is rare by the late Republic. *defit* may be rustic at V. *Ecl.* 2.22, colloquial at Prop. 1.1.34, and perhaps archaic at Liv. 9.11.6. **quin:** 68n. **benigne** = *large* (Don.).

769 satura atque ebria 'eaten and drunk your fill', but both words have connotations of overindulgence and recall the comic stereotype of old women as inveterate imbibers, like the midwife of *An.* 228–33 *temulenta mulier et temeraria*. See Cokayne 2003: 145–8. **facito:** the fut. imper. may, as here, mark a command of prospective rather than immediate fulfilment, e.g. *Eu.* 503 *si id non poterit, ad me adducito*, but the distinction is not consistently applied, e.g. *Eu.* 595 *cape hoc flabellum, uentulum huic sic facito* 'take this fan and make a bit of breeze for her'. The legal connotation of the form (*si in ius uocat, ilo* etc.) can lend an imperious tone that is probably also in play here.

770 Laches now catches sight (*uideo*) of Phidippus escorting the nurse inside, identifies him to Bacchis, and incidentally reminds the audience of his errand to fetch her. **socer** 'in-law'. Latin, like English, lacks a word for the relationship between parents of a married couple, so *socer*, properly 'father-in-law', is pressed into service.

771 deierat persancte: the prefix creates more earnest forms of *iuro* and *sancte*, as again with *dedo* for *do* at 773. Phidippus was understandably reluctant to meet Bacchis (721–5). Laches hopes to forestall any lingering hostility by declaring her goodwill, but Phidippus interrupts. **haecin east?** He has not seen her before – and clearly does not like what he sees now: *quasi dicat 'haec est quam uxori Pamphilus anteposit?'* (Don).

772 istae 'women like that'. **respicere** 'have regard for', as often of the gods' attention to mortals (*OLD* 8b). *eas* is the obj. and *deos* the subj. of the inf. Phidippus has little regard for her oath, however earnestly offered, since the gods would think nothing of her perjury.

The dismissal of Bacchis' testimony is, pointedly, directed toward Laches. Bacchis' rejoinder is, with equal point, directed squarely to Phidippus, who throughout the scene does all he can to avoid direct contact with her.

773 quolubet cruciati: cf. *Ad.* 483, where the slave Geta offers himself up for torture to confirm the truth of his report. The maids would be witnesses to Bacchis' activities, but as slaves, their evidence would only be legally admissible if given under torture (MacDowell 1978: 245–7). **per me** 'with my permission' (*OLD* 9), as required under both Attic and Roman law. The inquisitor would be responsible for any consequent damage to the slave property. The offer of a

slave for torture – made but never accepted, demanded but never fulfilled – is a familiar *topos* in Attic oratory, but more legal fiction than reality (Gagarin 1996).

774 hic: adv. ‘in this way’ (*OLD* 5). **Pamphilo:** a striking prolepsis, syntactically the dat. obj. of *redeat* (cf. 504 *redisti nobis*), but its position suggests an ethical dat. with *me facere*.

775 quod: pron., not conj. **non paenitet me** ‘I won’t be sorry’. The impersonal construction in comedy expresses dissatisfaction, not displeasure or regret (Fraenkel 1957: 5 n.6). **famae** ‘what is said [about me]’. The speech implied here introduces the following indirect statement. Bacchis repeats for Phidippus’ benefit her claim at 756–7.

776 aliae meretrices: e.g. Philotis and Syra. Attitudes introduced at the outset now return with renewed significance.

777 suspectas: i.e. *in suspicione positas* (Don.); cf. 792. Because a participle denoting a state remains adjectival, it does not necessarily form a compound tense (*NLS* §100). Latin can thus distinguish a moment in the past when the women were suspected (i.e. the perf. pass. *suspectas esse*) from the condition of being suspected (*suspectas*) in, or beginning in, the past (*fuisse*).

778 nobis: dat. of the person judging, e.g. *An. 530 haud dubiumst mihi*, Pl. *Cur. 100 tu mihi stacta . . . es* (*SEL* II. 145–6, *NLS* §65). **inuēnimus:** a true perf. Having insisted on his neighbour’s complicity in the original error, Laches now implicates him in its discovery. **porro** ‘by turn’ (*OLD* 4). **hanc** ‘Bacchis here’. Phidippus still refuses to acknowledge her directly.

779 compererit: syncopated fut. perf. **crimini** ‘a groundless charge’ (Don.). Word order and metre combine to create emphasis: fourth foot diaeresis puts stress on *crimini*, elision of *se uxor* merges subj. of verb and inf., while *c*-alliteration unites the two parts of the line.

780 missam faciet: 408n. **sin:** 559n.

781 quod: the clause explains *eam rem*. Laches adopts a wordy, pedantic tone to win over his recalcitrant neighbour. **leuest:** with characteristic overconfidence, he mistakes the biggest problem of the play for the smallest. His apparent error, as thoughtful members of the audience would perhaps recognize, springs from his belief that Philumena’s child is by Pamphilus. The irony was greater for Apollodorus’ audience, which almost certainly knew that Pamphilus really *was* its father. **ab eo . . . abscedet:** a noteworthy reversal of subj. and obj. Myrrina, he thinks, will lay aside her irritation; Pamphilus’ irritation will simply leave him. Laches sees his son as a victim, Myrrina as an agent of their common distress.

782 discidio: at 693 Laches spoke somewhat vaguely of *discordia*, but subsequent exchanges strengthened the desire for formal divorce.

783 exquire: as at 773. Laches is in effect continuing Bacchis' appeal in the face of Phidippus' stubborn refusal even to acknowledge her. **adest:** sc. Bacchis.

784 quid 'why?' (adv). **an:** when introducing a single question, the particle suggests impatience or annoyance, e.g. *Hau. 911 an dubiumst id tibi?* 'Can you doubt it?', *Ad. 136 an non credis?* 'You don't believe me?'

785 animus meus ut sit: prolepsis. Phidippus made his feelings clear at 635–6, 722–4. **ut** = 'how' (145n.) **illis,** i.e. Philumena and Myrrina. **explete animum:** he unwittingly echoes Laches at 755, the pl. verb being as close as he ever comes to acknowledging Bacchis' presence. The following action makes clear that Phidippus now enters his house, though the exit is not signalled in the text. Having washed his hands of the business, he will not return. (See 791n.)

786–93 The following dialogue adds nothing to what has already been said – the value of Bacchis' intervention, her willingness to act against type, and Laches' desire for her to do so – but this exchange, together with the stage business it makes possible as Bacchis and her entourage approach the house door, enhances the drama of what will prove to be the decisive action of the play. T.'s manipulation of pace is quite astute.

786 edepol: the oath marks the urgency of Laches' request. **quod mihi es pollicita:** i.e. her offer at 751–2.

787 ob eam rem . . . introeam: the deliberate jingle, enhanced by the change of speaker at the diaeresis, may be an instance of Bacchis' professional wit. **coge ut:** 674n. The double command – not just say it, but make them believe it – is a further sign of Laches' urgency.

788 meum conspectum 'sight of me'. **hodie:** this could be temporal (the time is particularly unfavourable for a visit from Pamphilus' quondam mistress), but the adv. is quite frequently a simple emphazier, e.g. *Ph. 376–7 contumelias numquam cessavit dicere hodie* 'he has not ever stopped speaking slanders'. Other good exx. at *An. 410*, *Ph. 1009*, *Ad. 215* with Don. ad loc. The two senses of the word appear in close proximity at *Eu. 800–3* and *Ad. 212–15*.

789 hostis: a strong word for T., who elsewhere uses *inimicus* of a private foe, e.g. 211, 767, but cf. Pl. *Bac. 534 estne hic meus sodalis? :: estne hic hostis quem aspicio meus?* and *St. 140 hostis est uxor inuita quae ad uirum nuptum datur*.

790 haec: 101n.

791 This line duplicates the sense (and underlying structure) of 790. It does not appear in our oldest MS (A) and is placed (nonsensically) after 783 in two other MSS, but this (not 790) is the line Don. comments on. Retaining them both would require giving one to Phidippus (retention and attribution represent separate editorial interventions), but the duplication is pointless and Phidippus'

exit at 785 almost certain. Only one line belongs in the text, but which? A hard decision, though the verbosity of 790 might better suit Laches. The difference is in any case slight. The variant probably originated in performance and then found its way into a master text: there is no indication that T. revised his script between one failed performance and the next, as Aristophanes did with *Clouds* and Euripides with *Hippolytus*. Duplicate lines (and scenes) in Pl. have been explained as performance variants (e.g. Goldberg 2004, Marshall 2006: 266–72). Textual doublets and variants are rarer in T., with the notable exception of *An.*, which acquired an alternative ending at some point in its later stage history.

793 perii: a weak exclamation here, e.g. ‘damnation!’ (Barsby). **pudet Philumenaē:** the gen. represents the person before whom or on whose account the emotion is felt: *NLS* §73(4). Bacchis’ hesitation only makes sense if spoken aside and indicates her genuinely good, if not entirely disinterested, intentions. She then pulls herself together and, with an imperious gesture to her maids, has them accompany her into Phidippus’ house.

794 huic: sc. *Bacchidi*. **euenire:** to be understood with both *intellego* and *malim*.

795 sine suo dispendio ‘without cost to herself’. Contrast Thais of *Eu.*, who assumes the expense of buying and raising a slave-girl in hope of gaining the *beneficium* of the Athenian family to which she plans to restore her (146–9, 870–1). Her reward will be their *aeterna gratia* (872).

796 si est ut: 501n. **segregarit:** syncopated perf. subjunc. indicating the possibility of this past action. Cf. *Ph.* 270 *si est . . . culpam ut Antipho in se admisierit*, ‘if it’s true that Antipho has committed a crime’. See Ernout-Thomas 1953: 303–5.

797 nobilitatem ‘renown’, which at this period does not necessarily imply high social standing. So in Pl., the slave Gripus dreams of fame, not rank (*Rud.* 933), as does the soldier Pyrgopolynices (*Mil.* 1324). Don. comments, *et meretrix et gladiator nobilis dici solet*. **ex eo:** i.e. the fact she has sent Pamphilus away. **rem** ‘wealth’ (*OLD* 1a). **natam** ‘spring’ (*OLD* 10), taken closely with *ex eo* and understood with all three nouns. The part. is predicative: *esse* alone is the subordinate verb. **gloriam** ‘honour’.

798 ei: sc. *Pamphilo*. **unaque . . . opera** ‘at the same time’ (*OLD* 1d). **amicos:** predicative. Laches seems more preoccupied with the potential rewards than is Bacchis herself, perhaps a measure of his venality and another of the play’s reversals of expectation, this one the values of *senex* and *meretrix*. An older style of criticism, intent on turning at least the underlying Greek New Comedy into a well-made play, built from these and similar indications an original ending for Apollodorus that rewarded Bacchis for her *nobilitas* by having her recognized as Myrrina’s long-lost daughter (e.g. Kuiper 1938: 35–46, the father being Phania, Laches’ deceased relative on Imbros!). For the dramatic aesthetic underlying

such a reconstruction, see Goldberg 1986: 61–75. As noted by Gilula 1980: 161n. Athenian dramatic protocol precluded so otherwise satisfying a recognition for a *hetaira*.

Laches now enters his house and will not return. Both fathers exit believing that a reconciliation is coming: once Bacchis confirms Pamphilus' loyalty to Philumena, the women will surely drop their objections to him and Pamphilus will happily return to wife and child. They are right that a resolution is coming, but not for the reason – and not quite for the crisis – they imagine.

Viii: Parmeno, joined by Bacchis (799–840)

Parmeno at last returns from his fool's errand to the acropolis (430–43). His entrance monologue inverts the traditional running slave routine – he is slow, annoyed, and all too aware that he lacks a message to deliver – but the closest parallel is actually old Demea's return from a similarly (and designedly) futile mission at *Ad.* 713–18, the play produced along with *Hec.* at the funeral games of Aemilius Paullus. The effect in both instances is richly comic, enhanced in Parmeno's case by his palpable loss of swagger. He is hardly the aspiring *callidus* introduced at 76. This speech, together with Laches' exit monologue above, provide the time for Bacchis to complete her errand within, though comic convention requires only the suggestion, not the actual duration of an appropriate interval.

The rhythm shifted in 798 from iambic to trochaic, and the present scene runs throughout in trochaic septenarii.

799 ne: 274n. **parui preti:** gen. of value. Parmeno's main complaint is that his time has been wasted. The toll on his ego is greater than that on his body.

800 ob rem nullam 'a wild goose chase'. **misit:** 419n. **frustra:** part of the *ubi*-clause. **ubi:** temporal adv. (*OLD* 9a), although Parmeno is also thinking of where he has spent his day; cf. 183, 522. **desedi** 'sat idle' (*OLD* 2).

801 A reminder for the audience of where and why he has been missing.

802 ineptus hodie 'like a complete fool', a predicative adj. with intensive adv. (788n.). **illi** = *illic* (94n.). **sedeo:** pres. indic. is regular when *dum* = 'during the time that' (*NLS* §221). **ut quisque** 'whenever anyone' (*OLD* s.v. *ut* 19).

803 accedebam: an iterative imperf., i.e. a repeated but not necessarily habitual action in the past, e.g. Pl. *Poen.* 486 *ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam* 'whenever someone appeared, I would kill him' (*SEL* 1. 31–2). **adulescens:** anyone neither *puer* nor *senex*, i.e. from late adolescence to the early 30s, might appropriately be called *adulescens*, whereas *homo* might be thought too abrupt, familiar,

or pejorative (828n.). Attic Greek, with a wider vocabulary of age available, e.g. ἔφηβος, νεανίσκος, ἀνὴρ, preferred μαιράκιον (e.g. Men. fr. 250, 538, *Dys.* 27 with Sandbach's note), perhaps for a similar reason. **dicdum:** 315n., the effect further softened by the polite *quaeso*. Though slaves at Rome, as at Athens, were not necessarily distinctive in appearance, Parmeno assumed that anyone he approached was his social superior and so spoke accordingly. He had previously shown a facility for mimicking speech (131, 148n.) and probably does so again here.

804 non 'no'. The simple negation of a factual statement or question is rare, though more frequent in T. than Pl. (Thesleff 1960: 56). Given the initial denial, the remaining questions are of course superfluous, but Parmeno is anxious to demonstrate his persistence.

805 quemquam 'anyone at all'. Parmeno's realization that his errand is fraudulent produces a laugh at his expense. (Demea gets a similar laugh at *Ad.* 716–17.)

806 denique: often strengthened, as here, by another, similar adv. (*OLD* 1b). **pudebat:** humiliation rather than shame. **sed:** Parmeno reacts to a commotion at Phidippus' house door as Bacchis returns to the stage. Her two maids ought to accompany her, though they are not mentioned.

807 ab nostro adfine 'from our in-laws'. Parmeno, with his habitual presumption (e.g. 76), speaks as a member of the family. Cf. Laches' *noster socer* (770, 211n.). **huic:** sc. *Bacchidi*. **rei:** 97n.

808 propere curre: Parmeno's reaction to this command will be immediately apparent from his posture.

809 eo: the adv. of place is easily applied to a more personal goal of motion, e.g. *Hau.* 335 *ad tuam matrem abducetur*. :: *quid eo?* **ad te:** since Parmeno knows her affair with Pamphilus is over, he either expresses surprise at what seems an unexpected request or, more probably, feigns innocence in hope of learning what is going on around him. **immo** 'no', correcting an error (Thesleff 1960: 64–7).

810 quid rei est: the repetition of 807 shows how little progress Parmeno has made in learning anything of importance. **refert:** 510n.

811 nil aliud: a less subtle attempt to wheedle further details from Bacchis. **etiam** 'yes' (Thesleff 1960: 34–5). **Myrrinam:** subj. of *cognosse*. A verb of speaking is readily understood from *dicam*. The word order of this and the following line sets the importance of its ideas over their grammatical relationship.

812 gnatae suae: as described at 574. The audience would by now be well aware that the climax was coming, and an increasing number would presumably

be able to guess how it will come about. **scio**: an affirming response (Thesleff 1960: 31). Parmeno recalls Pamphilus' gift of the ring to Bacchis, not its source.

813 tantumne est? The supposedly *callidus* Parmeno does not seem to recognize the significance of this discovery, though Bacchis knows it will be immediately apparent to Pamphilus (*aderit continuo*).

814 sed cessas? Parmeno has not moved. He is a consistently reluctant messenger (360, 436), converted from running slave to slave-on-the-run (Gilula 1979/80: 147–8), and Bacchis must prod him into action. **minime**: a frequent negative (Thesleff 1960: 60–2). **potestas** 'opportunity' (*OLD* 5b). Parmeno seems deliberately to misunderstand the question. Bacchis means 'why do you delay?' (*OLD* 1), but he responds to 'why are you standing idle?' (*OLD* 4).

815 totum . . . diem: a reminder of the play's short time frame. This will be Parmeno's fourth errand of the day. He has already been to the harbour twice (197, 360) and up to the acropolis (443), and he long ago complained of exhaustion (*ita defessus sum*, 443). The running slave had a distinct look, tunic fastened high and cloak thrown over the shoulder. Parmeno here probably adjusts himself accordingly and then makes his exit toward the wing in the required style, if not necessarily at the expected pace. For the traditional *currens* figure, see Duckworth 1936, Csapo 1993, Lowe 2009.

Now alone on the stage, Bacchis describes her encounter with Myrrina and the discovery that makes possible the play's resolution. Her monologue complements the earlier narrative of Pamphilus (361–408): the close correspondence of these two speeches is heightened by strong structural parallels, from the initial removal of Parmeno to the use of direct speech to the solution of the seemingly intractable problem revealed by Pamphilus' story of the rape (Prescott 1939: 120–1, Gilula 1979/80: 145–7, 156). Since she seems to be taking the audience into her confidence, we might expect her to come forward and address them, but if so, she will need to retreat at the close, as the subsequent stage action shows (854). The speech is set off from the preceding dialogue by modulation from trochaic to iambic septenarii.

816 meo: the characteristic diaeresis of the iambic septenarius clearly places this adj. with *aduentu*, not *Pamphilo*.

817 res . . . curas: the pl. turns a specific statement into a global declaration. Cf. *An.* 910–11 *tunc hic homines adulescentulos imperitos rerum . . . in fraudem illis?*, where only one such enticement is at issue. **autem** 'also' (*OLD* 3).

818–20 Bacchis declares the resolution at a single stroke of the three hitherto separate problems of the play: the embarrassment of the child's birth, the separation of the young couple, and Pamphilus' estrangement from father and father-in-law. Result precedes cause in her narrative to drain the last bit of suspense from the revelation, though few by now would fail to understand the significance of the ring.

818 harunc = *harum* (from **hasom* + *-ce*, Ernout 1953: 92). **operā** ‘thanks to’ (*OLD* 1c, 228n.). She alludes to Myrrina’s willingness to expose the child and Pamphilus’ refusal to acknowledge it, which would have made such exposure inevitable. Bacchis presumably learned this from Myrrina.

820 suspectus . . . fuit: 777n. **exsolui:** abl. obj. is *re*.

821 hic adeo . . . anulus ‘this very ring’, *adeo* serving as an intensive particle (*OLD* 8). We have already heard about this ring (574, 811). Bacchis now holds it up for us to see. It is, presumably, the reward for her unselfish intervention since Myrrina has allowed her to keep it. **his rebus . . . inueniundis:** dat. with *initium*; cf. *huic rei caput* ‘the cause of this business’ (*An.* 458, *Ad.* 568).

822 abhinc mensis decem fere ‘about ten months ago’; cf. *Ad.* 475, of another birth, *mensis decumus est*. Since Romans counted inclusively, this would be nine months by modern reckoning, the normal time. **nocte prima** ‘at nightfall’, lit. ‘in the early part of the night’ (*OLD* 3b: *primis partibus noctis*, Don.); cf. *Pl. Cur.* 4 *si media nox est, siue est prima uespera* ‘if it’s the middle of the night, if it’s early evening’. Why Philumena should be out alone at night is unexplained. Attic comedy conventionally set these assaults at nighttime festivals, e.g. Tauropolia (*Men. Epit.* 451), Adonia (*Men. Sam.* 39).

823 anhelantem: sc. *Pamphilum*. The acc. subj. is easily supplied. **sine comite:** a person of Pamphilus’ status would normally have an escort, especially at night, for protection and to light the way. The lack of witness is, of course, dramatically necessary. **uini plenum:** the usual reason. Cf. *Ad.* 470, excusing a similar attack, *persuasit nox, amor, uinum, adulescentia*.

824–9 These lines develop from a different perspective the events Myrrina described at 572–6. Such extended exposition is inevitable in a plot that works from the audience’s ignorance rather than, as more often in New Comedy, with its omniscience. This rationing of information was T.’s innovation, since it apparently involved significant changes in his model in addition to suppression of any expository prologue. Don., e.g., noted that he shortened the revelation here by turning a dialogue into a monologue (*breuitati consuluit Terentius, nam in Graeca haec aguntur, non narrantur*, ad 825). Scholars have long debated the specifics of his changes and how Apollodorus structured the original action (e.g. Denzler 1968: 13–18, Lowe 1983: 438–42, Lefèvre 1999: 54–6). No reconstruction has proved satisfactory. More serious a problem than the role of T.’s *breuitas* in creating and resolving suspense is the resulting abruptness of his conclusion, which explicitly abandons traditional ideas of dramatic closure. (See 866n.) Bacchis’ speech well suits her character: *mi* + *voc.* and the softening interjections *amabo* and *obsecro* are characteristically female mannerisms (Dutsch 2008: 49–55) and produce precisely that *blanditia* the situation demands.

825 exanimatu's: adj. here with pres. verb. Cf. *An.* 234 *sed quid nam Pamphilum exanimatum uideo?* (= *perturbatum*, Don.) and *An.* 342 *quem . . . exanimatum quaerere* (= *perterritum et perturbatum*, Don.). **aut** = *et* (*OLD* 4).

826 simulare: hist. inf. governing the ind. statement. T. favours such inf. in narrative and description, e.g. *An.* 62–4, *Eu.* 410–12 (four each). Pamphilus, embarrassed, ignores her questions, which further arouses Bacchis' suspicion. **uideo:** hist. pres., another mark of vivid narration.

827 suspicari: the only such archaic inf. in T. not at line end, though diaeresis follows here. The punctuation understands *suspiciari* and *instare* as complements of *coepe*. Punctuation after *suspiciari*, i.e. historic inf., would be possible, followed then by *magis coepe instare*. **dicat:** pres. sequence is normal after the inf. (*SEL* I. 344–5).

828 homo: the connotation is often pejorative, e.g. *Hau.* 530 *hominem pistrino dignum!* 'a man fit for the mill!', *Ph.* 642 *a primo homo insanibat* 'at first the rogue was quite unreasonable' (*OLD* 3b), but wry condescension is equally likely here, as *Ad.* 143 (Micio of his brother) *nam itast homo* 'he's that sort of man'. **nescioquam** 'some girl or other'. The expression adds a note of callousness or flippancy to the narrative. Contrast Myrrina's pathos at 572–4.

829 illi: dat. of the person affected. Cf. Pl. *Truc.* 652 *homo cruminam sibi de collo detrahit*, 'the fellow took the purse from around his neck'. **luctat:** classical written Latin regularizes the deponent *luctor*, and this active form, also found in Pl., Ennius, and Varro, then drops from view (Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 225). The ring, by this account, came off accidentally in the struggle; Myrrina had made its removal sound deliberate (*ipse eripuit ui . . . uirginem abiens anulum*, 574). Pamphilus would of course be in a better position to know the truth, though Myrrina might understandably think the attacker a thief as well as a rapist.

830 eum: sc. *anulum*. **haec . . . Myrrina** 'Myrrina here', said with a gesture toward her house. Hiatus at the diaeresis lengthens the final vowel of Myrrina. That hiatus could be avoided by scanning *modō*, as at *An.* 630 (a scansion clear from the cretic metre). The choice of phrasing would in performance have been determined by the music, not so narrowly by the metre. **habentem:** 551n.; cf. Pl. *Cur.* 595 *ubi med hunc habere conspicatist anulum*. Pamphilus' readiness to give Bacchis the ring may suggest an eagerness to put the story of its acquisition out of his mind.

831 unde: 809n. **cognitio** 'recognition', built from *cognouit* at 830, appears first here and at *Eu.* 921. (In *Ad.*, T. creates the analogous abstract noun *monstratio* at 715 from *monstrabo* at 570: cf. Giangrande 1955: 531–2.) The word here may be T.'s coinage; like Gk. ἀνγνώσις, it eventually became a technical term of literary criticism, e.g. Euphrasius ad *An.* 904 *haec scaena cognitionem habet puellae, quod ciuis Atheniensium sit*. As a neologism, it is unlikely to signal a metatheatrical allusion

of the sort found at Men. *Epit.* 1121-2 $\nu\upsilon\upsilon\iota$ δ' ἀναγνωρισμὸς αὐτοῖς γέγνε καὶ ἅπαντ' ἀγαθὰ, 'now they've had their recognition and everything's wonderful'. For recognition as a plot element, see Hunter 1985: 130-6, and for its role in Aristotelian structural analysis, Else 1967: 349-55 ad *Poet.* 52a24-31. Since *cognitio facta* = *cognitum est*, an inf. clause follows naturally.

832 This first explicit, unequivocal statement of the true state of things is of a kind conventionally found in expository prologues, e.g. Pl. *Aul.* 28-9, *Capt.* 40-3, *Truc.* 18-19.

833 propter: causal (*OLD* 5). Cf. *An.* 271 *egon propter me illam decipi miseram sinam*...? 'Shall I allow the poor girl to be betrayed because of me?'

834-5 These lines recall Bacchis' earlier attempt to establish herself contrary to type (e.g. 735, 756-7), as well as the opening discussion of Philotis and Syra on the natural hostility of *meretrices* to marriage (58-75). Her altruism stands in marked contrast not only to her type, but to the self-interest of the play's male characters, which may be why T. emphasizes it here.

835 quisquam: as an adj., the intensifier is stronger than *ullus* (*OLD* 6), e.g. Pl. *Truc.* 239 *numquam satis dedit suae quisquam amicae amator* 'No lover ever gave enough to his girlfriend', T. *Ph.* 279 *an quisquam iudex est qui*... 'Is there any judge at all, who...'

836 quaesti: 735n. **ad malas... partis** 'to bad behaviour' (*OLD* 10). The only such generalizing pl. in T., who otherwise expresses a similar idea with the sing., e.g. *An.* 193 *animum aegrotum ad deteriorem partem plerumque applicat*, 'He tends to steer the lovesick heart in the wrong direction' (Barsby); cf. *Eu.* 632, *Ad.* 3.

837-40 Bacchis contradicts Parmeno's claim that the affair with Pamphilus ended badly (158-9), and both Parmeno's deflation in the finale and the residual good feeling soon evident between Bacchis and Pamphilus confirms her account. The monologue, which was probably T.'s innovation (824-9n.), seems calculated to prepare for such a resolution.

837 dum...licitumst 'while circumstances permitted'. The deponent is common, e.g. *An.* 443 *dum licitumst ei*, *Hau.* 819 *quam non licitumst tangere*, but the perf. act. is also found, e.g. *Hau.* 965 *tibi non licuit. illo* is obj. of *usa sum*. Interlocking word order combines with the diaeresis to set the three adjectives in the second colon.

838 incommode 'inconvenient'. A mild word: Bacchis' equanimity contrasts with Syra's opening indignation at news of the marriage. **nuptiis:** abl. of cause; cf. *nuptiis laetetur*, 835 (*NLS* §45). The verb is impersonal.

839 at 'though admittedly', introducing an additional fact to consider (*OLD* 6); cf. 134n., and for the varied uses of this particle, Dunkel 1988: 63-73. **me**

fecisse 'I brought it about that' (*OLD* 15a), introducing the result clause. **id:** the marriage. Bacchis claims she did nothing to alienate his affection, an idea supported by Parmeno's statement that the marriage came about at Laches' instigation (116–24).

840 quo: sc. *Pamphilo*. **fuertint:** generic subjunc., the perf. indicating completed action. **commoda:** the result of Pamphilus' conduct when *benignus, lepidus et comis* (837). The pragmatic Bacchis is willing to accept the rough with the smooth.

Viv: Pamphilus, Parmeno, Bacchis (841–81)

Bacchis' monologue has occupied sufficient dramatic time for Parmeno to find and return with Pamphilus, who has received his news with evident delight. As they enter in conversation from the wing, Bacchis retreats to stand unnoticed by her house door (854).

The change of tone from monologue to dialogue is signalled by a shift from iambic to trochaic rhythm.

841 mi Parmeno: 232n. The good news creates in Pamphilus an affable excitement. **etiam** 'again' (*OLD* 1b). Pamphilus is anxious to hear the news repeated to be sure it is true. As Don. observes, *quod misere cupimus, idem tardius credamus effectum* and notes similar anxiety expressed at *Hau.* 197–8, *Ad.* 698. **sodes:** 70n. **ut . . . attuleris:** the perf. subjunc. may follow *caue* in Pl. and T. (e.g. *Ad.* 458 *caue dixeris!* 'Don't speak of it!') but seems anomalous here in what is structured as an indirect command after *uide*. Pamphilus in his excitement may be conflating two ideas, *ut mi certa et clara offeras* and *ut haec certa et clara sint quae mi attulisti*. Strictly grammatical constructions are not always to be expected in language designed to recall the vagaries of ordinary speech; cf. 308–9n.

842 This line too seems ungrammatical: *conicias* 'you bring me to a condition' (*OLD* 11) is not regularly constructed with an infinitive phrase. Cf. *Hau.* 292 *ne me in laetitiam frustra conicias*, 'Don't fill me with false hopes.' Emendation to *coniciam* (Grant 1984: 35–6) improves the grammar, but the addled syntax might again be designed to suit the dramatic moment. **falso:** either a pred. adj. ('as a false thing') or an adv. ('under false pretences'). Metre might favour the latter.

843 uisumst: echoes Pamphilus' *uide*; cf. *manedum . . . maneo* below. Such anaphora commonly indicates assent, e.g. Pl. *Mer.* 324 *uide sis modo etiam. :: uisumst* (Thesleff 1960: 17–18). **deus sum:** the ultimate mark of happiness. Thus Pl. *Cur.* 167 (Phaedromus catching sight of his beloved) *est lepida . . . sum deus*. T. alludes to this conceit at *An.* 960–1, *Hau.* 693. See Flury 1968: 94–6.

844 manedum 'Wait a minute!' Pamphilus continues to doubt his good fortune and fears he has mistaken the message.

845–7 Pamphilus' insecurity makes possible a strategically placed review of the central revelation, the 'what' but without the 'why'. Contrast Bacchis' full disclosure at 830–2. The point here is less to remind the audience of what they need to know than to set up one final joke at Parmeno's expense: he is given the facts but consistently fails to recognize their significance (873).

845 dixē: syncopated perf. inf.; cf. *sperasse* (147), and for contraction of *xs* to *x*, *dixti* (671, 677, 865).

846 anulum suum: the ring is clearly Philumena's property, not her mother's (574, 811–12, 825–9). The reflexive adj. therefore refers not to Myrinna as subj. of *inuenisse*, but to Bacchis, subj. of *habere*, i.e. 'the ring Bacchis was wearing'. For *suum* where we might expect *eius*, see de Melo 2010: 89–99. Pamphilus then specifies that this was the ring he gave Bacchis, leaving out the fact that he took it from Philumena. The truth gradually revealed to the audience is thus kept just beyond Parmeno's understanding. **factum:** another confirmatory location (Thesleff 1960: 20–1). **ei:** sc. *Bacchidi*. **inquam:** Parmeno is getting a little impatient with his master's pedantic recitation.

848 uenustatis adeo plenior 'any fuller of lover's luck'. *uenustas* and *uenustus*, 'charm' and 'charming', never lose their original association with Venus (e.g. Pl. *Bac.* 115 *Amor, Voluptas, Venus, Venustas, Gaudium, Mos*. 161 *Venus uenusta*; T. *An.* 245 *inuenustus* of a frustrated lover), and *plenus* itself may suggest divine presence (*OLD* 1c); cf. Pl. *Poen.* 255–6 *diem . . . uenustatis plenum | dignum Veneri*. **adeo:** pro 'nimis' (Don. ad *Eu.* 204 *adulescentem adeo nobilem*).

849 qui: neut. abl. sing. *dono* is regularly constructed with acc. of the recipient and abl. of the gift received, e.g. Pl. *Truc.* 530–1 *adduxi ancillas . . . duas: is te dono*.

850 nihilo: the answer to *qui*, and thus in the same case. **enim:** 238n. Pamphilus' deliberative question leads to this play on dramatic convention: clever slaves expect and may demand rewards for their service, e.g. Epidicus (710–31), Pseudolus (1313–31), but Parmeno affects resignation and disappointment.

851 Parmeno fishes for information with this profession of ignorance, but he is doomed to enduring frustration. As Don. notes here, *quanto magis Parmeno curiosus est, tanto magis nesciat illa quae cupit*.

852 ab Orco . . . in lucem: like Heracles and Perithoos. References to Orcus are numerous in Pl., both quasi-serious (e.g. *Capt.* 283, *Epid.* 176) and overtly comic (e.g. *As.* 606, *Bac.* 368), but this and 875 are the only ones in T. The extravagance of the expression is especially striking since the mythological and divine references so common in Pl. are all extremely rare in T. (Duckworth 1952: 295–300). **feceris:** perf. subjunc. in a concessive rel. clause, whose antecedent [*te*] is the obj. of *sinam*.

853 ignauom 'ignoble' (*OLD* 4). Parmeno might well think this, since his master promptly turns away from him on seeing Bacchis and never completes the

thought. The abrupt shift is further emphasized by the tibicen's sudden silence: the formulaic approach and greeting of 854–8 are spoken, not sung.

854 *eccam*: 246n.

855 *me expectat*: Pamphilus guesses this from Parmeno's message. To whom is he speaking? Self-address would heighten the artificiality of the moment; an address to Parmeno would strengthen the dramatic illusion. ***salve, Pamphile*:** in a conventional comic approach, the character initiating the recognition speaks first (e.g. *Pl. Cur.* 216–35, *Pers.* 13–16, *Rud.* 331–6). Bacchis, waiting to be noticed, seizes the initiative.

857 *uolup*: though conventionally taken to be an adv. (*OLD*), the phrase *uolup est* 'it's a pleasure' may in fact be adjectival, i.e. **uolup(e) est* (Weiss 2009: 147 n. 83). The expression is common in Pl. but in T. appears only here and *Ph.* 610. ***factis*:** probably abl. with *facis*. Her deeds show that her expression of pleasure is genuine.

858 *antiquam*: 92n. ***obtines*** 'keep up' (*OLD* 2). Happiness leads Pamphilus to wax sentimental over their former relationship. Does he still respond here to the erotic thrill of Bacchis' presence? His words may support, but do not mandate, playing the scene this way. See Introduction 3.2.2 and 869n.

859 *uoluptati*: pred. dat. ***obitus*** 'encounter' (*OLD* 1), by chance, whereas *aduentus* suggests a meeting by arrangement (Don.). The exuberance of the compliment is augmented here by resumption of the music.

861 *homo . . . quisquam* 'anyone at all', a stock expression in comedy (e.g. *An.* 245, *Hau.* 81, *Eu.* 324). The word order is as deliberately convoluted as the sentiment, combining *homo quisquam numquam te uiuat blandior* 'no man alive is more agreeable than you are' and *unus omnium tu blandissimus uiuas* 'you alone are the most agreeable man alive'. Bacchis matches Pamphilus' compliment in structure while exceeding it in extravagance. Verbal skill was part of the *meretrix*' stock in trade. Thus the collections of witticisms by *hetairai* cited at Athen. 579–85.

862 *hahahae*: an approving laugh; cf. *Eu.* 497 *hahahae*. :: *quid rides?* (Müller 1997: 92–3). ***tun*** = *tu + ne*, sc. *dicis*. ***amasti*:** inceptive aorist perf.

863 *quod nossem*: 760n., a limiting clause with potential subjunc. (*SEL* 1. 295–6); cf. *Ad.* 641 *non equidem istas [fores], quod sciam*, 'not that door – as far as I know'. Athenian social convention would certainly have kept Philumena out of her sight, though Roman dramatic convention makes them immediate neighbours. Apollodorus' stage geography may have been different (98n.).

864 *perliberalis*: 164n. A favourite word for good conduct in T.'s moral vocabulary (e.g. *An.* 330, *Ph.* 282, *Ad.* 464). ***ita . . . ament*:** a positive response to *dic uerum* (106n.).

865 harunc rerum numquid: as with *num* alone, the expression invites a negative response. Compliments over, Pamphilus now comes to the subject on his mind but must be deliberately indirect in Parmeno's presence. **iam** 'already' (*OLD* 3). **patri:** the father in question is unspecified. Either his or hers is possible. Phidippus is inside (785n.) and in the more logical position to converse with Myrrina (cf. 870–1), but Pamphilus may well be more concerned about his own father.

866 muttito: 104n. **placet:** *mihi* might be understood, but its omission is striking. Pamphilus asserts a general principle that not everyone may share (868n). **ut in comoediis:** though rare in T., generic references like this are common in Pl., e.g. *Ps.* 1081–2 *uerba quae in comoediis solent lenoni dici*. So too *Am.* 987, *Mos.* 1152, *Ps.* 1240, with *fabula* used in a similar way at *Cas.* 1006, *Poen.* 551, *Ps.* 288. The effect of these 'metatheatrical' moments – the term is itself problematic – is difficult to judge and part of a longstanding debate over the extent to which ancient drama cultivated an 'illusion' which dramatists might or might not 'break' (e.g. Görler 1973, Bain 1977: 1–12, 208–22, Slater 1985: 3–18, Moore 1998: 1–6, Rosenmeyer 2002). Rosenmeyer, e.g., thinks they represent 'playful exuberance and comic discrepancy, which are part of the very idea of the genre of comedy' (105), but Don. clearly takes this one seriously: *quasi haec non comoedia sit sed ueritas*. It certainly has a serious implication: by avoiding a full recognition, Pamphilus escapes its full consequences. Where Menander's Charisios, facing a similar threat to his marriage for a similar reason, eventually confronts both the fact of his wife's pregnancy and his own responsibility for her condition (e.g. *Epit.* 908–32, with Goldberg 1980: 68–71; 1986: 150–2), Pamphilus discovers the truth but learns nothing from it. Whether this was Apollodorus' ending or represents a Terentian innovation remains unclear. See Introduction 3.2.3, and for the Greek analogues, Appendix II.

867 resciscunt: the standard verb for discovery in Roman comedy, often conveying a wish to avoid it (190n., Anderson 2002: 2–3). **hic** 'in this case' (*OLD* 5). **quos:** i.e. himself, Bacchis, Myrrina, and Philumena. **fuerat:** 561n.

868 neque resciscent neque scient: i.e. will neither find out nor deduce for themselves (Don.). Whether this ending is delicate or cynical remains an open question. Past opinion is well surveyed by Lefèvre 1999: 56–9. Dark readings are currently the fashion, e.g. James 1998: 46, 'a powerful critique of the coercive, self-centred masculine sexuality that characterizes Roman marriage'; Penwill 2004: 140, 'the happy outcome for all concerned will be founded on a lie'.

869 immo: confirmatory (Thesleff 1960: 64–5). **etiam** 'also' (*OLD* 3). **qui,** 'whereby' (*OLD* 4a), and like *ut*, constructed with a clause of purpose. **hoc:** Bacchis is also deliberately indirect in Parmeno's presence and sounds

eager to support Pamphilus' conspiracy of silence: the chemistry between the former lovers is very striking (Penwill 2004: 139–40, Sharrock 2009: 237–9).

870 iureiurando meo: dat. with *fidem habuisse*. The archaic dat. in *-ei*, still found at Aug. *Anc.* 15 *plebei Romanae uiritim HS trecenos numerauī*, generally contracts to the familiar *-ī* of classical Latin (Palmer 1961: 245, Weiss 2009: 244–5), but a dat. in *-ē* appears in certain formulae, e.g. *iure ciuili studere, lex opere faciundo* (Ernout 1953: 40). Phidippus has previously shown himself eager to preserve the marriage (263–6, 635–6, 722–4, 783).

871 sibi 'in her eyes'.

872 nobis: the referent is wonderfully vague. The two families are presumably meant, but Pamphilus' warmth toward Bacchis might include her as well. **ex sententia** 'satisfactorily' (*OLD* 1d), a common expression in T. (*Hau.* 683, 765; *Ph.* 256; *Ad.* 371, 420). Bacchis presumably returns to her house at this point, leaving Parmeno one last chance to gain his master's attention.

873 ere: 188n. **quid . . . boni:** Parmeno resumes the line of inquiry interrupted at 852.

875 hunc ab Orco mortuom: a sly echo of Pamphilus' claim at 852. The missing verb is presumably *reduxi*. *hunc* indicates a line spoken aside, either self-address or directed to the audience as Parmeno muses on his situation. Some editors (e.g. Marouzeau, Barsby) punctuate as a question, i.e. Parmeno not stating what he did but wondering how he did it. **nescis:** Pamphilus responds directly to *suspitor*, implicitly denying Parmeno any claim to the role of *callidus*. The play will end not with the slave's triumph, but with his frustration.

877 immo uero: an emphatic objection ('Yes, I have.' Barsby), but Pamphilus, recognizing the bluff, responds ironically. **an:** 784n.

878 Parmeno: third-person reference to oneself is vaguely pretentious; cf. *Eu.* 925, *Ph.* 1027, *Ad.* 763. **praetereat** 'pass by' (*OLD* 1c), a potential subjunc. **usu' sit:** 327n. Parmeno's last boast is laughably inapt since he has consistently sought to *avoid* doing things and has never understood the value of anything he has done. So, rightly, Don., though he knew a tradition (not attested in extant MSS) that instead made this Bacchis' exit line. Some MSS assign it to Pamphilus, which is possible but spoils the joke.

879 equidem: emphatic (Solodow 1978: 104). Parmeno is finally resigned to his ignorance. For the sentiment, cf. Pl. *Capt.* 44–5 *saepe iam in multis locis | plus insciens quis fecit quam prudens boni*. The play ends, as it began, with the contradiction of a comic stereotype.

880 plaudite! 'Give us your applause!' The curtainless stage requires some way to signal the play's end: here Parmeno steps out of character to provide the necessary indication. All six Terentian plays end with variants of this formula,

which became something of a cliché. For Cic. *Sen.* 70 *usque ad 'plaudite' ueniendum est* means, in effect, 'until the final curtain'. So Quint. 6.1.52 invokes the phrase *quo ueteres tragoediae comoediaequae clauduntur 'plodite'*. The extra-dramatic injunction is signalled somewhat mysteriously in the MSS by a lower case omega, perhaps recalling the algebraic notation used to mark the actors' parts in ancient scripts (cf. Jory 1963, Gammacurta 2006: 7–32). The ascription to 'Cantor' found in the OCT goes back to a suggestion by Bentley ad *An.* 981, citing Hor. *Ars* 155 *sessuri donec cantor 'uos plaudite' dicat*, but the importation of such a figure makes little stage sense. The concluding address to the audience found in Pl. is sometimes fuller (and funnier), assigned to *grex* at *As.*, *Bac.*, *Epid.* and to *caterua* at *Capt.* and *Cist.* The corresponding Greek convention found in Men. (*Dys.*, *Sam.*, *Mis.*, *Sik.*), Posidippus (*PCG* VI.11–13) and P. Oxy. 1239 (*PCG* VI.2 fr. 903, Men.?) is more solemn.

APPENDIX I: PHILUMENA'S PREGNANCY

Parmeno must have been telling the truth when he said that Pamphilus, while still obsessed with Bacchis, did not immediately consummate his marriage (135–47, 409–13) because Pamphilus, on discovering the pregnancy, at once assumes that the child about to be born is not his (376–7). Since that deduction might not be obvious, T. makes the chronology explicit in Pamphilus' report of Myrrina's appeal to him.

parturire eam nec grauidam esse ex te solus consciu's;
nam aiunt tecum post duobus concubisse mensibus;
tum, postquam ad te uenit, mensis agitur hic iam septimus.
quod te scire ipsa indicat res.

(392–5)

Ten lunar months is the normal course of a pregnancy (cf. *Ad.* 474–5, *Pl. Aul.* 798), and so this means that Philumena carried the child to term: Bacchis will later confirm that the rape took place some ten months before.

nam memini adhinc mensis decem fere ad me nocte prima
confugere anhelantem domum sine comite, uini plenum,
cum hoc anulo.

(822–4)

These details would all fall into place, as might be expected in a dramatic style known for careful plotting, were it not for the fact that Phidippus, who knows only the date of the marriage and nothing about the earlier rape, immediately assumes, when he learns of the birth, that it was not only uneventful but on time.

sed demiror
quid sit quam ob rem hunc tanto opere omnis nos celare uolueris
partum, praesertim quom et recte et tempore suo perpererit.

(529–31, cf. 397–9)

Commentators since Don. have wrestled with the resulting inconsistency.¹ Placing the rape two months before the marriage and its consummation two months after makes some sense out of this testimony. Yet that would mean Phidippus presumes a seven-month pregnancy, which though considered viable even in antiquity, would hardly be *suo tempore*.² Something is amiss . . . but what?

¹ Don. ad 393.5, where his text is uncertain (Martin 1972), and ad 383.7, glossing Myrrina's *olim as ante menses nouem*, probably with 822 in mind. See Schadewaldt 1931: 2–4, who attributes the problem to T. ('Terenz habe im Gegensatz zu Apollodor die Chronologie ungenügend herausgearbeitet', 2).

² So Don. ad 531, *quia et* [i.e. 'even'] *septimani nasci solent*, and the long discussion at Gell. 3.16, citing Menander and Caecilius. Schadewaldt 1931: 3 n. 2. cites the ancient technical

No satisfactory solution to the chronological problem has ever emerged, but that may be because the underlying difficulty is not in fact chronological. The testimony itself is worth reconsidering. Some scholars, unhappy with the nervous syntax of 392–3, point out that the sense could be thought continuous from 392 directly to 395. They then solve the problem by dismissing the troublesome lines 393–4 as an interpolation.³ The reason for this intrusion, however, is impossible to imagine: glosses and other sources of interpolation normally simplify, not complicate a problem. Further, what Parmeno, Myrrina and Bacchis all say is not only internally consistent but in harmony with what they might reasonably be expected to know. The odd and improbable statement is by Phidippus. He was unaware that his daughter was even pregnant until he heard the baby crying (517–18, 641). How, then, would he know that the birth was *recte et suo tempore*? His declaration, just after he has asked the play's central question about the child, comes as he is slowly reconciling himself to Myrrina's distinctly equivocal reply.

peperit filia: hem, taces? ex qui? :: istuc patrem rogare est aequom?
 perii! ex quo censes nisi ex illo quoi datast nuptum obsecro?
 :: credo, neque adeo arbitrari patris est aliter.

(527–9)

His words, as they continue the process of reconciliation, may well reflect not what he actually knows about the birth but what he wants to be true. Contrast the response of the much shrewder Laches, no less surprised by these events but happy to accept the child as the solution to their common problem. He is not at all curious – is he deliberately *incurious*? – about the timing of its arrival (639–54). It is Phidippus, weak, henpecked, and indecisive, as the action consistently reveals him to be, who must turn the problem over in his mind . . . and in the process gets himself thoroughly confused. Chremes, the bumbling bigamist of *Phormio*, is a comparable figure. So is Nikeratos of Menander's *Samia*, whose slow-witted response to his neighbour Demeas' sophistries are brilliantly exploited in the play's climax as he is led to accept the consequences of his daughter's rape by Demeas' son. Because T., like Menander (and Apollodorus?) before him, likes plots to turn on points of character, i.e. what his figures do springs directly from who they are, the complexities and inconsistencies that occasionally surface are more likely designed to reflect the realities of human frailty than marks of artificiality or error in plot construction.

literature. The imprecision of the second-century Roman calendar must have made the onset of pregnancy difficult to calculate in hindsight, or at least discouraged accurate calculation. Don. of course knew the vastly more precise Julian calendar, but whether his suggested chronology is his own or derives from a Republican source is unknown.

³ So most forcefully Jachmann 1934: 639, for whom *quod* at 395 = *nec gravidam esse ex te*. There is a rejoinder by Bianco 1962: 102–4 and good discussion by Büchner 1972: 135–6. The lines might originate in Apollodorus' prologue, which could explain their putative intrusion here.

APPENDIX II: GREEK ANALOGUES

Hecyra's focus on a young couple after their marriage, though unusual in the comic tradition, is not unique. T.'s immediate model, the *Hekyra* of Apollodorus of Carystos, does not survive, but a fragmentary, possibly Menandrian play preserved on papyrus also appears to involve a troubled marriage, and so certainly did Menander's *Epitrepontes* (*The Arbitrants*), sometimes thought to have influenced Apollodorus.¹ *Epitrepontes* was among the first of Menander's plays to be rediscovered in the twentieth century and remains one of his most appealing works, remarkable both for the skilful pacing of its revelations and the sensitivity of its characterizations.² Its situation, in a nutshell, is this:

In her husband Charisios's absence, Pamphile bore and exposed an apparently illegitimate child, the product of a rape shortly before her marriage. Upon his return, Charisios learned of these events from an officious slave (Onesimos) and fled in great distress to a friend's house, where he attempts to console himself with the services of a cithara-girl (Habrotonon). As the play opens, Pamphile's father, outraged by his behaviour, attempts to intervene. Then, after the baby reappears, a series of deft interventions by Habrotonon and Onesimos leads Charisios to discover first that he himself fathered an illegitimate child and is thus hardly a moral paragon, and only then that his victim was in fact Pamphile: the child she exposed was his own. Reconciliation becomes possible, but not before Charisios experiences what Aristotle considered the most satisfactory kind of reversal, brought about by the discovery of the facts and recognition of their full significance.³

The play was quite popular in the Greek world, as is clear from the number of different papyri that preserve it, but whether anyone in T.'s Roman audience would have known it or, if they did, thought of it in the context of *Hecyra* is not at

¹ The fragmentary play (P. Antinoopolis 15) is Incerta 6 in Arnott 2000: 505–27. Less formal unions are under stress in Menander's *Misoumenos* (*The Hated Man*) and *Perikeiromene* (*The Shorn Girl*), while *Samia* divides and then (rather abruptly) reunites the common-law couple Demeas and Chrysis. The debt of Apollodorus to Menander is largely speculative, as is clear from Webster 1970: 225–52.

² The fifth-century codex, P. Cairo 43227, which originally contained at least five plays, was first published in 1907. (Koenen 1978 provides excellent photographs.) Additional fragments on other papyri continue to be identified and have made important additions to our knowledge. See Arnott 2004. The edition of choice is now Furley 2009, which includes material unavailable to Sandbach (OCT) and Arnott (Loeb).

³ Cf. Arist. *Poet.* 52a22–32. For Menander's debt here to tragic ideas of recognition, see Porter 1999/2000: 166–70, Traill 2008: 261–4, Furley 2009: 233–4.

all certain. Modern readers of T., who do often know it, readily note two points for comparison and contrast.⁴

First, Charisios' outwardly similar dilemma develops quite differently from what Pamphilus experiences. His initial response to his wife's situation was as priggish as that of his Roman counterpart, though it may also reflect a specifically Athenian anxiety over the legitimacy of children that was inevitably altered, if not entirely lost, in the fantasy world of the *palhata*.⁵ He was also at least as violent as Pamphilus was in his original assault on an unsuspecting girl (486–90, cf. *Hec.* 828–9). What rescues Charisios in our estimation is his capacity for growth. Having overheard his wife defend his conduct to her father, he is deeply moved by her loyalty and forced to acknowledge the comparative shoddiness of his own conduct toward her. That shattering recognition is carefully orchestrated for maximum effect. As suits an action largely developed by surrogates, we first learn of his remorse from Onesimos (879–907). Then Charisios appears and speaks for himself.⁶

ἐγὼ τις ἀναμάρτητος, εἰς δόξαν βλέπων
καὶ τὸ καλὸν ὃ τι πτότ' ἔστι καὶ ταῖσχροὺν σκοπῶν,
ἀκέραιος, ἀνεπίπληκτος αὐτὸς τῷ βίῳ –
εὖ μοι κέχρηται καὶ προσηκόντως πάνυ
τὸ δαιμόνιον – ἐνταῦθ' ἔδειξ' ἀνθρωπος ὢν.
'ὦ τρισκακόδαιμον, μεγάλα φυσαῖς καὶ λαλεῖς,
ἀκούσιον γυναικὸς ἀτύχημ' οὐ φέρεις,
αὐτὸν δὲ δεῖξω σ' εἰς ὅμοι' ἐπταικότα,
καὶ χρήσεται αὐτῇ σοι τότ' ἡπίως, σὺ δὲ
ταύτην ἀτιμάξεις· ἐπιδειχθήσεται θ' ἅμα
ἀτυχῆς γεγονῶς καὶ σκαιὸς ἀγνώμων τ' ἀνὴρ.
ὁμοιά γ' εἶπεν οἷς σὺ διενόου τότε
πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, κοινωνὸς ἦκειν τοῦ βίου,
ἔπειτα δ' οὐ δεῖν τ' ἀτύχημ' αὐτὴν φυγεῖν
τὸ συμβεβηκός. σὺ δὲ τις ὑψηλὸς σφόδρα . . .

(908–22)

⁴ The claim of Sharrock 2009: 240 that 'Terence requires us to see a pointed contrast here with this play's strongest surviving intertext, Menander's *Epitrepontes*' conflates ancient and modern perspectives. 'Requires', 'us', and 'strongest' are all problematic terms; 'surviving' confesses the modern bias. Roman knowledge of Menander is itself problematic. T. had to travel to Greece to find plays to adapt (*Vita* 5); Cic. *Fin.* 1.4 implies that reading Menander in Greek was an affectation (Fantham 1984).

⁵ Konstan 1995: 141–52, Lape 2004: 246–52.

⁶ The speech continues in this vein for another ten lines before moving to dialogue with Onesimos and Habrotonon, but the text becomes increasingly lacunose beyond this point. The speech seems to mark Charisios' first, possibly only, appearance in the play, which develops most of its action through surrogates (Goldberg 1980: 63–70).

I was somebody blameless, looking to my reputation,
 weighing what is right and what is wrong,
 without fault, without reproach in my own life –
 a divine power taught me a proper lesson,
 all right! Then I showed I was only human.
 ‘You complete oaf, giving yourself airs and talking big,
 you won’t tolerate a wife’s involuntary misfortune,
 but I’ll show you’ve stumbled into the same fix.
 She’ll treat you kindly then, while you
 insult her. You’ll be revealed to be
 unlucky and gauche and a brute all at once.’
 How what she said to her father contrasted with
 your position! That she came as a partner for life,
 so it isn’t right to run away when some chance misfortune
 struck. But you, Mr. High-and-Mighty . . .

It is hard to imagine Pamphilus, intent on secrecy (*neque opus est adeo multito*, 865–6), making such a speech. Nor does he earn his redemption through suffering as Charisios does.

Still more striking in its contrast with *Hecyra* is the scene that brings Charisios to this state. When her father, Smikrines, tries to force Pamphile to abandon her estranged, apparently profligate husband – not an entirely unreasonable recommendation under the circumstances – Pamphile defends him with great power and nobility (702–835). The specifics of her defence, which is not preserved in the Cairo codex, have only recently become clear from other sources, and we can now see how Charisios, in his deep emotion, actually echoed the very words of her response to Smikrines:⁷

πότερον ἤλθον εὐτυχοῦντι μὲν
 συνευτυχήσουσ’, ἂν δ[’ ἀτυχήσῃ μηκέτι
 αὐτῷ προίδω; μά τὸν [Δί’
 κοινωνὸς ἤλθον τοῦ βίου, τί δ’ εἰ τυχὸν
 ἔπταικεν;

(817–21)

Did I come only to share
 in his good fortune, but no longer see to him
 in misfortune? By heaven . . .
 I came as a partner for life. So what if he happens
 to have stumbled?

⁷ The new material, cited here from Furley 2009, has not yet been officially published. The square brackets show that the papyrus is missing the right half of the column: supplements are necessarily tentative. The scene’s Euripidean echoes are examined in detail by Porter 2000: 160–5.

Still more remarkable than what she says, at least for readers coming to this moving scene from *Hecyra*, is the fact that she has such a scene at all and can make such a speech.

Respectable girls (and girls who turn out to be respectable) rarely appear and even more rarely speak in New Comedy. Pregnant girls never appear, though their off-stage cries in childbirth are a comic convention.⁸ Young *married* women, however, can play a significant part, as demonstrated not only by *Epileptontes*, but by an unidentified fragment in which another wife resists her father's demand that she abandon her impoverished husband.⁹ Scholars were once tempted to place her forty-four line response to her father here in *Epileptontes*, and though that is now clearly not the case, the similarity to Pamphile's speech may hint at a comic *topos* at work, e.g.

ἡ πῶς δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἢ καλῶς ἔχον
τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν με τὸ μέρος ὧν εἶχεν λαβεῖν,
τοῦ συναπορηθῆναι δὲ μὴ λαβεῖν μέρος;
(24–6)

How is it just or right to take
my share of the good things he has had
and not to take a share of his losses?

T. does not create so strong a figure. He instead casts Philumena in the role of wronged innocent, like the girls of *Andria* and *Adelphoe*, denying her a significant role in her own story. The powerlessness of all the play's women thus seems to be quite consciously contrived, and, given the range of available possibilities revealed by the Greek analogues, may well reflect T.'s own decision to end the play in this way.¹⁰

⁸ So Men. *Georgos* 112–13, Pl. *Aul.* 691–2, T. *An.* 473, *Ad.* 486–8. The speaking role for Knemon's daughter (Men. *Dys.* 189–206) is facilitated by her poor, rustic condition – and the echo of Euripides' Electra. The status of the title figure in Men.'s *Theophroroumene* (*The Girl Possessed*) is unknown. See Traill 2008: 259–60. Visible pregnancy is unique to Pl. *Am.* and may be a target there of fun (Phillips 1985, Christenson 2001).

⁹ P. Didot 1 = *PCG* vi.2 1000 = no. 3 Page 1962: 180–9, also reproduced with translation by Traill 2008: 242–4. Good summary discussion (but no text) in Arnott 2000: 414–16.

¹⁰ How Apollodorus treated the wife is a separate question only tangential to T.'s resolution. As his decision not to stage Bacchis' encounter with Myrrina shows (see 824–gn.), whether to follow or alter the Greek model could be T.'s choice to make.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin sexual vocabulary*, Baltimore
 1984. 'Female speech in Latin Comedy', *Antichthon* 18: 43–77
 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*, Cambridge
- Allen, W. S. 1973. *Accent and rhythm. Prosodic features of Latin and Greek. A study in theory and reconstruction*, Cambridge
 1978. *Vox latina. The pronunciation of classical Latin*, 2nd edn, Cambridge
- Anderson, W. S. 2002. 'Resistance to recognition and "privileged recognition" in Terence', *Classical Journal* 98: 1–8
- Arnaud, P. 2005. *Les routes de la navigation antique. Itinéraires en Méditerranée*, Paris
- Arnott, W. G. 1985. 'Terence's prologues', *Papers of the Leeds Latin Seminar* 5: 1–7
 1995. 'Menander's manipulation of language for the individualisation of character', in F. de Martino and A. H. Sommerstein, eds. *Lo spettacolo delle voci* (Bari) 147–64
 1996. *Alexis: The Fragments*, Cambridge
 2000. *Menander*, vol. III. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA
 2004. 'Menander's *Epilepentes* in the light of the new papyri', in D. L. Cairns and R. Knox, eds. *Law, rhetoric and comedy in classical Athens. Essays in honour of D. M. MacDowell* (Swansea) 269–92
- Bader, B. 1971. 'The $\psi\acute{o}\phi\omicron\varsigma$ of the house-door in Greek New Comedy', *Antichthon* 5: 35–48
- Bagordo, A. 2001. *Beobachtungen zur Sprache des Terenz*, Göttingen
- Bain, D. 1977. *Actors and audience. A study of asides and related conventions in Greek drama*, Oxford.
- Barsby, J. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*, Cambridge
 2000. 'Donatus on Terence: the *Eunuchus* commentary', in E. Stärk and G. Vogt-Spira, eds. *Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag* (Hildesheim) 491–513
 2002. 'Terence and his Greek models', in Questa and Rafaelli 2002: 251–77
- Beacham, R. 2007. 'Playing places: the temporary and the permanent', in McDonald and Walton 2007: 202–26
- Beare, W. 1942. 'The life of Terence', *Hermathena* 59: 20–9
 1964. *The Roman stage. A short history of Latin drama in the time of the republic*, London
- Benz, L., E. Stärk, and G. Vogt-Spira, eds. 1995. *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels*. ScriptOralia 75. Tübingen
- Bernstein, F. 1998. *Ludi publici. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele im republikanischen Rom*. Historia Einzelschriften 119. Stuttgart
- Bers, V. 2009. *Genos dikanikon. Amateur and professional speech in the courtrooms of classical Athens*, Washington, DC
- Bianco, O. 1962. *Terenzio: problemi e aspetti dell'originalità*, Rome
- Bieber, M. 1961. *The history of the Greek and Roman theater*, Princeton

- Blanchard, A. 1970. 'Recherches sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre', *Revue des études latines* 83: 38–51
- Blundell, J. 1980. *Menander and the monologue. Hypomnemata* 59, Göttingen
- Braun, L. 1970. 'Polymetrie bei Terenz und Plautus', *Wiener Studien* 4: 66–83
- Bräunlich, A. F. 1918. 'The confusion of the indirect question and the relative clause in Latin', *Classical Philology* 13: 60–74
1920. *The indicative indirect question in Latin*, Chicago
- Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on poetry. The Ars poetica*, Cambridge
- Brown, P. G. McC. 2002. 'Actors and actor-managers at Rome', in Easterling and Hall 2002: 225–37
2004. 'Soldiers in New Comedy: insiders and outsiders', *Leeds International Classical Studies* 3.08 (<http://lics.leeds.ac.uk>)
2007. 'Movements of characters and pace of action in Terence's plays', in Kruschwitz et al. 2007: 175–88
- Browne, R. A. 1931. 'A sentiment from Sophocles' *Teukros*', *Classical Review* 45: 213–14
- Bruder, H. W. 1970. *Bedeutung und Funktion des Verswechsels bei Terenz*, Zurich
- Cameron, A. 2011. *The last pagans of Rome*, Oxford
- Carney, T. F., ed. 1963. *P. Terenti Afri Hecyra*, Pretoria
- Ceccarelli, L. 1991. 'Prosodia e metrica latina arcaica 1956–1990', *Lustrum* 33: 227–400
- Chalmers, W. R. 1965. 'Plautus and his audience', in Dorey and Dudley 1965: 21–50
- Christenson, D. 2001. 'Grotesque realism in Plautus' *Amphitruo*', *Classical Journal* 96: 243–60
- Cicu, L. 1988. *Problemi e strutture del mimo a Roma*, Venice
- Clackson, J. and G. Horrocks. 2007. *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*, Oxford
- Cohen, D. 1991. *Law, sexuality, and society. The enforcement of morals in classical Athens*, Cambridge
- Cokayne, K. 2003. *Experiencing old age in ancient Rome*, London
- Conte, G. B. 1994. *Latin literature, a history*, tr. J. Solodow, Baltimore
- Cooper, G. L., III. 1998. *Attic Greek prose syntax*. 2 vols. Ann Arbor
- Courtney, E. 1993. *The fragmentary Latin poets*, Oxford
1995. *Musa lapidaria. A selection of Latin verse inscriptions*, Atlanta
- Croce, B. 1966. 'Terence', in *Philosophy, poetry, history: an anthology of essays*, tr. C. Sprigge (Oxford) 776–801
- Csapo, E. G. 1989. 'Plautine elements in the running-slave entrance monologues?', *Classical Quarterly* 39: 148–63
1993. 'A case study in the use of theatre iconography as evidence for ancient acting', *Antike Kunst* 36: 41–58
2002. 'Kallipides on the floor-sweepings: the limits of realism in classical acting and performance styles', in Easterling and Hall 2002: 127–47

- Csapo, E. G. and W. Slater, eds. 1995. *The context of ancient drama*, Ann Arbor
- Dale, A. M. 1969. *Collected papers*, Cambridge
- Davidson, J. 1997. *Courtesans and fishcakes. The consuming passions of classical Athens*, New York
- Davis, C. B. 2003. 'Distant ventriloquism: vocal mimesis, agency and identity in ancient Greek performance', *Theatre Journal* 55: 45–65
- de Melo, W. D. C. 2007. *The early Latin verb system. Archaic forms in Plautus, Terence, and beyond*, Oxford
2009. 'Scies (Mil. 520) e scibis (Mil. 1365): variazioni accidentali?', in Raffaelli and Tontini 2009: 41–52
2010. 'Possessive pronouns in Plautus', in Dickey and Chahoud 2010: 71–99
- Denzler, B. 1968. *Der Monolog bei Terenz*, Zurich
- Deufert, M. 2002. *Textgeschichte und Rezeption der plautinischen Komödien im Altertum*, Berlin
- Devine, A. M. and L. S. Stephens. 1980. 'Latin prosody and meter: *brevis brevians*', *Classical Philology* 75: 142–57
- Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin forms of address from Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford
- Dickey, E. and A. Chahoud, eds. 2010. *Colloquial and literary Latin*, Cambridge
- Dixon, S. 1988. *The Roman mother*, London
- Dodwell, C. R. 2000. *Anglo-Saxon gestures and the Roman stage*, Cambridge
- Dorey, T. A. and D. R. Dudley, eds. 1965. *Roman drama*, New York
- Dover, K. 2002. 'Some evaluative terms in Aristophanes', in Willi 2002: 85–97
- Duckworth, G. 1936. 'The dramatic function of the *servus currens* in Roman comedy', in *Classical studies presented to Edward Capps* (Princeton) 93–102
1952. *The nature of Roman comedy*, Princeton
- Dunkel, G. E. 1988. 'Indogermanisch *át, Vedisch átha', *Historische Sprachforschung* 101: 53–78
1996. 'The relative stylistic orality of Plautus and Terence, as measured by enjambment types', *Die Sprache* 38: 201–12
- Dutsch, D. M. 2007. 'Gestures in the manuscripts of Terence and late revivals of classical drama', *Gesture* 7: 39–70
2008. *Feminine discourse in Roman comedy. On echoes and voices*, Oxford
- Easterling, P. and E. Hall, eds. 2002. *Greek and Roman actors. Aspects of an ancient profession*, Cambridge.
- Else, G. F. 1967. *Aristotle's Poetics: the argument*, Cambridge, MA
- Ernout, A. 1953. *Morphologie historique du latin*, 3rd edn, Paris
- Ernout, A. and F. Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe latine*, 2nd edn, Paris
- Fairweather, J. 1983. 'Traditional narrative, inference and truth in the *Lives* of the Greek poets', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4: 315–69
- Fantham, E. 1972. *Comparative studies in republican Latin imagery*, Toronto
1981. 'Plautus in miniature. Compression and distortion in the *Epidicus*', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3: 1–28

1984. 'Roman experience of Menander in the late republic and early empire', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 299–309
2002. 'Orator and/et actor', in Easterling and Hall 2002: 362–76
2004. 'Terence and the familiarisation of comedy', *Ramus* 33: 20–34
- Fantham, E., H. Foley, N. B. Kampen, S. U. Pomeroy and H. A. Shapiro. 1994. *Women in the classical world*, Oxford
- Ferri, R. and P. Probert. 2010. 'Roman authors on colloquial language', in Dickey and Chahoud 2010: 12–41
- Flury, P. 1968. *Liebe und Liebesprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz*, Heidelberg
- Fontaine, M. 2010. *Funny words in Plautine comedy*, Oxford
- Fordyce, C. J. 1961. *Catullus. A commentary*, Oxford
- Fortson, B. W., IV. 2008. *Language and rhythm in Plautus*, Berlin
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*, Oxford
2007. *Plautine elements in Plautus*. Tr. by T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke of *Plautinisches im Plautus* (1922) and the supplement of *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (1960), Oxford
- Furley, W. D. 2009. *Menander*, Epitrepontes. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*. Supplement 106. London
- Gagarin, M. 1996. 'The torture of slaves in Athenian law', *Classical Philology* 91: 1–18
- Gaiser, K. 1972. 'Zur Eigenart der römischen Komödie: Plautus und Terenz gegenüber ihren griechischen Vorbildern', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 1.2: 1027–1113
- Gammacurta, T. 2006. *Papyrologica scaenica. I copioni teatrali nella tradizione papiracea*, Alexandria
- Garton, C. 1972. *Personal aspects of the Roman theatre*, Toronto
- Gelhaus, H. 1972. *Die Prologe des Terenz. Eine Erklärung nach den Lehren der inventio und dispositio*, Heidelberg
- Gerschner, R. 2002. *Die Deklination der Nomina bei Plautus*, Heidelberg
- Giangrande, G. 1955. 'Terenzio e la conquista dell' astratto in latino: un elemento di stile', *Latomus* 14: 525–35
- Gilula, D. 1979. 'Exit motivations and actual exits in Terence', *American Journal of Philology* 100: 519–30
- 1979/80. 'Terence's *Hecyra*: a delicate balance of suspense and dramatic irony', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 5: 137–57
1980. 'The concept of the *bona meretrix*. A study of Terence's courtesans', *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 108: 142–65
1981. 'Who's afraid of rope-walkers and gladiators? (Ter. *Hec.* 1–57)', *Athenaeum* 59: 29–37
1989. 'The first realistic roles in European theatre: Terence's prologues', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultural Classica* 33: 95–106
1996. 'The allocation of seats to senators in 194 BCE', in R. Katzoff, ed. *Classical studies in honor of David Sohlberg* (Ramat Gan) 235–44

- Görler, W. 1973. 'Über die Illusion in der antiken Komödie', *Antike und Abendland* 18: 41–57
- Goldberg, S. M. 1980. *The making of Menander's comedy*, Berkeley
- 1981/82. 'The dramatic balance of Terence's *Andria*', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 33: 135–43
1986. *Understanding Terence*, Princeton
1990. 'Act to action in Plautus' *Bacchides*', *Classical Philology* 85: 191–201
1995. *Epic in republican Rome*, Oxford
1998. 'Plautus on the Palatine', *Journal of Roman Studies* 88: 1–20
2004. 'Plautus and his alternatives. Textual doublets in *Cistellaria*', in R. Hartkamp and F. Hurka, eds. *Studien zu Plautus' Cistellaria* (Tübingen) 385–98
2005. *Constructing literature in the Roman republic. Poetry and its reception*, Cambridge
2011. 'Roman comedy gets back to basics', *Journal of Roman Studies* 101: 206–221
- Goldhill, S. 1997. 'The audience of Athenian tragedy', in P. E. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy* (Cambridge) 54–68
- Gowers, E. 2004. 'The plot thickens: hidden outlines in Terence's prologues', *Ramus* 33: 150–66
- Grant, J. N. 1984. 'Personal disagreements in the manuscripts of Terence', *Classical Philology* 79: 32–8
1986. *Studies in the textual tradition of Terence*, Toronto
- Gratwick, A. S. 1982. 'Drama', in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, eds. *The Cambridge history of classical literature*. Vol. 11: *Latin literature* (Cambridge) 77–137
1993. *Plautus, Menaechmi*, Cambridge
- Gruen, E. S. 1990. *Studies in Greek culture and Roman policy*, Leiden
1992. *Culture and national identity in republican Rome*, Ithaca
- Haffter, H. 1953. 'Terenz und seine künstlerische Eigenart', *Museum Helveticum* 10: 1–20, 73–102
- Hall, J. 2009. *Politeness and politics in Cicero's letters*, Oxford
- Hallett, J. P. 1984. *Fathers and daughters in Roman society*, Princeton
- Halporn, J. W. 1993. 'Roman comedy and Greek models', in R. Scodel, ed. *Theater and society in the classical world* (Ann Arbor) 191–213
- Handley, E. W. 2001. 'Actoris opera: words, action and acting in *Dis Exapaton* and *Bacchides*', in R. Raffaelli and A. Tontioni, eds. *Lecturae plautinae sarsinates IV: Bacchides* (Urbino) 13–36
2002. 'Theme and variations', in Questa and Rafaelli 2002: 105–20
- Hanson, J. A. 1965. 'The glorious military', in Dorey and Dudley 1965: 51–85
- Harris, W. V. 1994. 'Child-exposure in the Roman empire', *Journal of Roman Studies* 84: 1–22
- Haugen, K. L. 2011. *Richard Bentley. Poetry and enlightenment*, Boston
- Henry, M. 1985. *Menander's courtesans and the Greek comic tradition*, Frankfurt
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, Cambridge

- Hocquard, M. 1981. *Les verbes d'état en -ē- du latin*, Lille
- Hofmann, J. B. 1951. *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, 3rd edn, Heidelberg
- Horsfall, N. M. 1976. 'The Collegium poetarum', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 23: 79–95
- Hough, J. N. 1945. 'The *numquid vis* formula in Roman comedy', *American Journal of Philology* 66: 282–302
- Hristić, J. 1972. 'On the interpretation of drama', *New Literary History* 3: 345–54
- Hunter, R. L. 1985. *The new comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge
2006. *The shadow of Callimachus. Studies in the reception of Hellenistic poetry at Rome*, Cambridge
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2008. *Talking books. Readings in Hellenistic and Roman books of poetry*, Oxford
- Ireland, S. 1990. *Terence, The Mother-in-Law*, Warminster
- Jachmann, G. 1924. *Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum*, Basel
1929. *Terentius' codex vaticanus latinus 3868 phototypice editus*, Leipzig
1934. 'P. Terentius Afer', *RE* V A.1: 598–650
- Jakobi, R. 1996. *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*, Berlin
- James, S. L. 1998. 'From boys to men: rape and developing masculinity in Terence's *Heqyra* and *Eunuchus*', *Helios* 25: 31–47
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1969. *The Tragedies of Ennius. The fragments, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Cambridge
1995. 'The life-style of the ageing bachelor and theatrical improvisation (Plaut. *Mil.* 596–812)', in Benz et al. 1995: 107–22
- Johnson, W. R. 1968. 'Micio and the perils of perfection', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1: 171–86
- Jones, L. W. and C. R. Morey. 1931. *The miniatures of the manuscripts of Terence prior to the thirteenth century*, 2 vols. Princeton
- Jory, E. J. 1963. "'Algebraic" notation in dramatic texts', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 10: 65–78
1970. 'Associations of actors at Rome', *Hermes* 98: 224–53
1986. 'Gladiators in the theatre', *Classical Quarterly* 36: 537–9
- Karakasis, E. 2005. *Terence and the language of Roman comedy*, Cambridge
- Kaster, R. A. 1988. *Guardians of language: the grammarian and society in late antiquity*, Berkeley
1995. *Suetonius, De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, Oxford
1997. 'The shame of the Romans', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127: 1–19
- Klose, D. 1966. *Die Didaskalien und Prologe des Terenz*. Bamberg
- Knapp, C. 1907. 'Travel in ancient times as seen in Plautus and Terence', *Classical Philology* 2: 1–24, 281–304
- Knorr, O. 2007. 'Metatheatrical humor in the comedies of Terence', in Kruschwitz et al. 2007: 167–74

- Koenen, L., ed. 1978. *The Cairo codex of Menander (PCair. J. 43227) with a preface*, London
- Konstan, D. 1983. *Roman comedy*, Ithaca
1995. *Greek comedy and ideology*, Oxford
- Kruschwitz, P. 2001. 'Verszahlresponionen bei Terenz', *Philologus* 145: 312–23.
- Kruschwitz, P., W. W. Ehlers and F. Felgentreu, eds. 2007. *Terentius poeta*. Zetemata 127. Munich
- Kuiper, W. E. J. 1938. *Two comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus, Terence's Hecyra and Phormio*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 1. Leiden
- Kunkel, W. and R. Wittmann. 1995. *Staatsordnung und Staatspraxis der römischen Republik*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft X.3.2.2. Munich
- Lada-Richards, I. 2004. 'Authorial voice and theatrical self-definition in Terence and beyond: the *Hecyra* prologues in ancient and modern contexts', *Greece and Rome* 51: 55–82
- Laidlaw, W. A. 1938. *The prosody of Terence*, London
- Lape, S. 2004. *Reproducing Athens: Menander's comedy, democratic culture, and the Hellenistic city*, Princeton
- Lateiner, D. 2004. 'Gestures: the imagined journey from the Roman stage to the Anglo-Saxon manuscript.' Rev. of Dodwell 2000. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 10: 454–64
- Lebek, W. D. 1996. 'Money-making on the Roman stage', in W. J. Slater, ed. *Roman theater and society* (Ann Arbor) 29–48
- Lee, H. M. 1997. 'The later Greek boxing glove and the "Roman" caestus', *Nikephoros* 10: 161–78
- Lefèvre, E. 1999. *Terenz und Apollodors Hecyra*. Zetemata 101. Munich
- Leigh, M. 2004. *Comedy and the rise of Rome*, Oxford
- Leo, F. 1913. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Berlin
- Leppin, H. 1992. *Histrionen. Untersuchungen zur sozialen Stellung von Bühnenkünstlern im Westen des römischen Reiches zur Zeit der Republik und des Principats*. Bonn
- Lightfoot, J. L. 2002. 'Nothing to do with the *technitai* of Dionysus?', in Easterling and Hall 2002: 209–24
- Lowe, J. C. B. 1983. 'Terentian originality in the *Phormio* and *Hecyra*', *Hermes* 111: 431–52
2009. 'Terence and the running-slave routine', *Rheinisches Museum* 152: 225–34
- Luck, G. 1964. *Über einige Interjektionen der lateinischen Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg
- Ludwig, W. 1968. 'The originality of Terence and his Greek models', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 9: 169–82
- MacDowell, D. 1978. *The law in classical Athens*, Ithaca.
- Manuwald, G. 2010. *Roman drama. A reader*, London
2011. *Roman republican theatre: a history*, Cambridge
- Marouzeau, J. 1951. 'Quelques particularités du style térentien', in *Charisteria Thaddaeo Sinko* (Warsaw) 211–19

- Marshall, C. W. 1999. 'Quis hic loquitur? Plautine delivery and the "double aside"', *Syllecta Classica* 10: 105–29
2006. *The stagecraft and performance of Roman comedy*, Cambridge
- Martin, R. H. 1972. 'Donatus on *Hecyra* 393', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 19: 113–16
- Mastromarco, G. 2009. 'La maschera del *Miles Gloriosus*: dai greci a Plauto', in Raffaelli and Tontini 2009: 17–40
- Mattingly, H. B. 1959. 'The Terentian *didascaliae*', *Athenaeum* 37: 148–73
- Mayor, J. E. B. 1900. *Thirteen satires of Juvenal*, 2 vols. London
- McDonald, M. and J. M. Walton, eds. 2007. *The Cambridge companion to Greek and Roman theatre*, Cambridge
- McGarrity, T. 1980/81. 'Reputation v. reality in Terence's *Hecyra*', *Classical Journal* 76: 149–56
- Meiser, G. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt
- Millar, F. 1998. *The crowd in Rome in the late republic*, Ann Arbor
- Monaghan, P. 2002. 'The Plautine persona', in J. Barsby, ed. *Greek and Roman drama: translation and performance* (Stuttgart) 99–124
- Moore, T. J. 1995. 'Seats and social status in the Plautine theater', *Classical Journal* 90: 113–23
1998. *The theater of Plautus*, Austin
1999. 'Facing the music: character and musical accompaniment in Roman comedy', *Syllecta Classica* 10: 130–53
2007. 'Terence as musical innovator', in Kruschwitz et al. 2007: 93–109
2008. 'When did the *tibicen* play? Meter and musical accompaniment in Roman comedy', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138: 3–46
2012. *Music in Roman comedy*, Cambridge
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*, Cambridge
- Morris, E. P. 1890. 'On the sentence-question in Plautus and Terence: second paper', *American Journal of Philology* 11: 16–54
- Müller, R. 1997. *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*, Heidelberg
- Nesselrath, H.-G. 1990. *Die attische mittlere Komödie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin
- Norwood, G. 1923. *The art of Terence*, Oxford
- Nünlist, R. 2002. 'Speech within speech in Menander', in Willi 2002: 219–59
- Oakley, S. P. 1998. *A commentary on Livy. Books VI–X*, vol. II: *Books VII–VIII*, Oxford
- Orgel, S. 1991. 'What is a text?', in D. S. Kastan and P. Stallybrass, eds. *Staging the Renaissance* (London) 83–7
- Page, D. L. 1962. *Select papyri*, vol. III. *Poetry*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA
- Palmer, L. R. 1961. *The Latin language*, London
- Panayotakis, C. 2005. 'Nonverbal behaviour on the Roman comic stage', in D. Cairns, ed. *Body language in the Greek and Roman worlds* (Swansea) 175–93

- Parker, H. N. 1989. 'Crucially funny, or Tranio on the couch: the *servus callidus* and jokes about torture', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119: 233–46
1996. 'Plautus v. Terence: audience and popularity re-examined', *American Journal of Philology* 117: 585–617
2009. 'Books and reading Latin poetry', in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, eds. *Ancient literacies. The culture of reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford) 186–229
- Parkin, T. G. 2003. *Old age in the Roman world*, Baltimore
- Patterson, C. 1985. "'Not worth the rearing": the causes of infant exposure in ancient Greece', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115: 103–23
- Penwill, J. L. 2004. 'The unlovely lover of Terence's *Hecyra*', *Ramus* 33: 130–49
- Phillips, J. E. 1985. 'Alcumena in the *Amphitruo* of Plautus: a pregnant lady joke', *Classical Journal* 80: 121–6
- Pierce, K. F. 1997. 'The portrayal of rape in new comedy', in S. Deacy and K. F. Pierce, eds. *Rape in antiquity. Sexual violence in the Greek and Roman worlds* (London) 163–84
- Poliakoff, M. 1987. *Combat sports in the ancient world*, New Haven
- Porter, J. R. 1999/2000. 'Euripides and Menander: *Epitrepontes*, Act. IV', *Illinois Classical Studies* 24–25: 157–73
- Prescott, H. W. 1936. 'Silent roles in Roman comedy I', *Classical Philology* 31: 97–119
1937. 'Silent roles in Roman comedy II', *Classical Philology* 32: 193–209
1939. 'Link monologues in Roman comedy', *Classical Philology* 34: 1–23, 116–26
- Prete, S. 1970. *Il codice di Terenzio vaticano latino 3226*, Vatican City
- Questa, C. 1965. *T. Maccius Plautus Bacchides*, Florence
2001. 'Per un'edizione di Plauto', *Giornate filologiche 'Francesco della Corte'* 11 (Genoa) 61–83
- Questa, C. and R. Raffaelli, eds. 2002. *Due seminari plautini. La tradizione del testo. I modelli*, Urbino
- Raffaelli, R. and A. Tontini, eds. 2009. *Lecturae plautinae sarsinates XII. Miles Gloriosus*, Urbino
- Rawson, B. 1986. 'Children in the Roman family', in B. Rawson, ed. *The family in ancient Rome. New perspectives* (London) 170–200
- ed. 1991a. *Marriage, divorce, and children in ancient Rome*, Oxford
- 1991b. 'Adult-child relationships in Roman society', in Rawson 1991a: 7–30
- Rawson, E. 1987. '*Discrimina ordinum*: the *lex Julia theatralis*', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 55: 83–114
- Redard, G. 1956. 'Le rajouissement du texte de Plaute', in *Hommages à Max Niedermann. Collection Latomus* xxiii. Brussels. 296–306
- Reeve, M. D. 1983a. 'Aelius Donatus, *Commentary on Terence*', in Reynolds 1983: 153–6
- 1983b. 'Terence', in Reynolds 1983: 412–20

2000. 'Cuius in usum? Recent and future editing', *Journal of Roman Studies* 90: 196–206
- Rehm, R. 2007. 'Festivals and audiences in Athens and Rome', in McDonald and Walton 2007: 184–201
- Reynolds, L. D., ed. 1983. *Texts and transmission. A survey of the Latin classics*, Oxford
- Ribbeck, O. 1898. *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*, 3rd edn, Leipzig
- Richlin, A. 2005. *Rome and the mysterious orient. Three plays by Plautus*, Berkeley
- Ritschl, F. 1845. *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz*, Berlin
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. 1995. 'Enacting the law: Plautus' use of the divorce formula on stage', *Phoenix* 49: 201–17
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. 2002. "'Metatheater": an essay on overload', *Arion* 10: 87–119
- Rostagni, A., ed. 1954. *Suetonio. De Poetis e biografi minori; restituzione e commento*, Turin
- Saller, R. P. 1989. 'Patronage and friendship in early imperial Rome: drawing the distinction', in A. Wallace-Hadrill, ed. *Patronage in ancient society* (London) 49–62
- Sandbach, F. H. 1970. 'Menander's manipulation of language for dramatic purposes', in E. G. Turner, ed. *Ménandre. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*. Fondation Hardt Entretiens xvi (Geneva) 111–43
1978. 'Donatus' use of the name Terentius and the end of Terence's *Adelphoe*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 25: 123–45
1982. 'How Terence's *Hecyra* failed', *Classical Quarterly* 32: 134–5
- Scafuro, A. 1997. *The forensic stage. Settling disputes in Greco-Roman comedy*, Cambridge
- Scarpata, G. 1996. 'Postremo . . . fabulae (Ter. *Hecyra* 620)', *Paideia* 51: 30–1
- Schadewaldt, W. 1928. *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, 2nd edn, Berlin
1931. 'Bermerkungen zur *Hecyra* des Terenz', *Hermes* 66: 1–29
- Schmidt, P. L. 1989. 'Postquam ludus in artem paulatim uerterat. Varro und die Frühgeschichte des römischen Theaters', in G. Vogt-Spira, ed. *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom*. ScriptOralia 12 (Tübingen) 77–133
- Sear, F. 2006. *Roman theatres. An architectural study*, Oxford
- Segal, E. 1987. *Roman laughter*, 2nd edn, Oxford
- Sewart, D. 1974. 'Exposition in the *Hecyra* of Apollodorus', *Hermes* 102: 247–60
- Shapiro, J. 2010. *Contested Will. Who wrote Shakespeare?*, New York
- Sharrock, A. 2009. *Reading Roman comedy. Poetics and playfulness in Plautus and Terence*, Cambridge
- Slater, N. W. 1985. *Plautus in performance. The theatre of the mind*, Princeton
1992. 'Two republican poets on drama: Terence and Accius', *Drama* 1: 85–103
- Slings, S. R. 1992. 'Written and spoken language: an exercise in the pragmatics of the Greek sentence', *Classical Philology* 87: 95–109
- Solodow, J. B. 1978. *The Latin particle quidem*, Boulder, CO
- Soubiran, J. 1998. *Essai sur la versification dramatique des Romains: sénnaire iambique et septénaire trochaïque*. Paris

- Stephens, L. 1985. 'Indirect questions in old Latin: syntactic and pragmatic factors conditioning modal shift', *Illinois Classical Studies* 10: 195–214
- Suerbaum, W., ed. 2002. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band: Die archaische Literatur*, Munich
- Sutton, D. F. 1987. 'The theatrical families of Athens', *American Journal of Philology* 108: 9–26
- Tansey, P. 2001. 'New light on the Roman stage. A revival of Terence's *Phormio* rediscovered', *Rheinisches Museum* 144: 22–43
- Taplin, O. 1978. *Greek tragedy in action*, Berkeley
1993. *Comic angels and other approaches to Greek drama through vase-painting*, Oxford
- Taylor, L. R. 1937. 'The opportunities for dramatic performances in the time of Plautus and Terence', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 68: 284–304
- Thesleff, H. 1960. *Yes and no in Plautus and Terence*, Helsinki
- Thomadaki, M. 1989. 'La mise en scène du théâtre de Térence dans les commentaires de Donat', *Dioniso* 59: 365–72
- Traill, A. 2008. *Women and the comic plot in Menander*, Cambridge
- Traina, A. 1968. 'Terenzio "traduttore"', *Belfagor* 23: 431–8
- Treggiari, S. 1991a. *Roman marriage*, Oxford
- 1991b. 'Divorce Roman style: how easy and how frequent was it?', in Rawson 1991a: 31–46
- Umbrico, A. 2010. *Terenzio e i suoi nobiles. Invenzione e realtà di un controverso legame*, Pisa
- Vaan, M. de, 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*, Leiden
- Vickers, B. 2002. *Shakespeare, co-author. A historical study of five collaborative plays*, Oxford
- Victor, B. 1996. 'A problem of method in the history of texts and its implications for the manuscript tradition of Terence', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 26: 269–87
- 2007a. 'New manuscript sources of the Terence-text', in Kruchwitz et al. 2007: 1–14
- 2007b. 'Terentiana', *Classical Quarterly* 57: 117–24
- Vine, B. 2010. 'Latin *aliās* "at another time"', in B. Richard Page and Aaron D. Rubin, eds. *Studies in classical linguistics in honor of Philip Baldi* (Leiden) 123–40
- Warren, M. 1906. 'A new fragment of Apollodorus of Carystus', *Classical Philology* 1: 43–6
- Watson, A. 1967. *The law of persons in the later Roman Republic*, Oxford
- Webster, T. B. L. 1970. *Studies in later Greek comedy*, 2nd edn, Manchester
- Weiss, M. 2009. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor
- Welch, K. E. 2007. *The Roman amphitheatre*, Cambridge
- Welsh, J. T. 2011. 'Accius, Porcius Licinus, and the beginning of Latin literature', *Journal of Roman Studies* 101: 31–50
- Wessner, P., ed. 1902–8. *Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti*, 3 vols. Leipzig

- West, M. L. 1982. *Greek metre*, Oxford
- White, P. 1993. *Promised verse. Poets in the society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, MA
- Willi, A., ed. 2002. *The language of Greek comedy*, Oxford
- Williams, G. 1958. 'Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals', *Journal of Roman Studies* 48: 16–29
- Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian institution of the khoregia*, Cambridge
- Wiseman, T. P. 1995. *Remus. A Roman myth*, Cambridge
1998. *Roman drama and Roman history*, Exeter
2008. 'Praetextae, togatae and other unhelpful categories', in *Unwritten Rome* (Exeter) 194–9
2009. *Remembering the Roman people*, Oxford
- Wright, D. H. 2006. *The lost late antique illustrated Terence*, Vatican City
- Wright, J. 1974. *Dancing in chains: the stylistic unity of the comoedia palliata*, Rome
- Zagagi, N. 1995a. *The comedy of Menander*, Bloomington, IN
- 1995b. 'The impromptu element in Plautus in the light of the evidence of New Comedy', in Benz et al. 1995: 71–86
- Zetzel, J. E. G. 1981. *Latin textual criticism in antiquity*, New York
- Zorzetti, N. 1991. 'Poetry and the ancient city: the case of Rome', *Classical Journal* 86: 311–29

INDEX

Numbers prefixed by p. or pp. refer to pages. All other references are to line numbers in the Commentary. For further guidance, consult the headings and subheadings in the Introduction and Appendices.

- ablative: absolute 94; attendant circumstance 255, 737; cause 838; degree of difference 137; description 164, 270, 312, 441, 502, 532, 644, 737; instrument 218, 668, 758, 849; time 136, 144, 393; *see also* supine
- abuse (verbal): in T. p. 27; of audience pp. 4–6; of women p. 116, p. 157, 216, 223, 232, 600; *see also* misogyny
- Accius p. 1, 14
- accusative: adverbial 200; duration 87, 177, 185, 747; exclamation 198, 205; internal obj. 265, 321, 512; proleptic 280; *see also* supine
- act divisions p. 44, p. 180, 196, 515; *see also* empty stage
- adulescens* (defined) 803
- adultery 387
- Aemilius Paullus, L. pp. 17–18, 40, 225, 461
- aging 595, 619, 620–1, 747
- alliteration p. 31, 2, 127, 211, 229, 291, 306, 483, 574, 610, 779
- Ambivius Turpio pp. 3–4, p. 13, p. 46, p. 87, 5, 22, 27, 28, 39, 52, 198
- amica* 541, 684
- amicitia* 764
- Anaxandrides, fr. 93 *PCG*, 149
- Andronicus, Livius p. 1, p. 3, p. 30, p. 86
- Apollodorus of Carystos 325–6; and Menander p. 204; *Hekyra* of 243, 515, 798; quoted by Donatus 58, 287, 380, 620–1; T.'s departures from pp. 8–9, p. 171, 98, 196, 440, 572–4, 781, 824–9
- archaisms: spelling pp. 26–7, 154, 663; in later authors 189, 395; (verb forms) *faxint* 102; *fuat* 610; *perduint* 134, 441; *scibo* 246; *siet* 145; *-ier* pass. inf. 104, 827; (other forms) *deum* (gen. pl.) 198; *istaec* 74; *puere* (voc.) 719; *qui* (abl.) 527, 555, 573, 750, 849; *quita* (part.) 572; *-ei* (dat.) 870; *-i* 4 decl. gen. 356, 735
- Aristophanes 86, 791
- aside p. 180, 436, 463, 564, 616, 628, 701–5, 729; overheard 453, 671; *see also* dramatic conventions
- Athens: drama at p. 2, p. 7, p. 84, 27, 86; law and society of 139, 387, 734, 803; and Imbros 171, 433; v. Corinth 86
- Atticism p. 13, 32
- audience: involvement of pp. 4–6, p. 116, p. 128, p. 192, 29, 111, 335, 510; taste of 33
- Bacchis: against type 158, 735, 756, 834–5; character debated p. 18, p. 21, p. 180; patronage of 734, 747, 764; *see also* hetairai, women
- Bentley, Richard pp. 37–8, 201, 633, 729, 880
- Caecilius Statius: and Ambivius Turpio p. 3, p. 11, p. 16, 22, 37; and T. p. 10, 14; style of p. 30; *Hypobolimaes* p. 14n. 45; *Plocium* p. 9n. 25, 478
- Callimachus p. 9, p. 30
- Calliopius pp. 43–4
- cantor 880
- Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (A) p. 43, p. 45, 64, 509, 557, 663, 791
- colloquialisms pp. 27–9; diminutives 143, 177; ellipsis 62, 215; oaths 58; pleonasm 67, 587, 733; pres. for fut. 513; subjunc. for imper. 638; supine of purpose 77; syntactic looseness 187, 273; word order 103, 241, 549; 4 conj. imperf. in *-i* 172, 246; *ain* 415; *cedo* 458, 708; *illi* (adv.) 94; *istaec* 593; *nihi lo magis* 137; *potis est* 395; *si for num* 321, 429; *sine* 600, 707; *see also* archaism
- comodia palliata*: canon of poets p. 14, 56; defined p. 1; style of p. 30, 14; traditionality of p. 12, p. 20, p. 205; *see also* Introduction 1.3, Appendix II
- conative present 73, 237, 293(?)
- conditions: indic. 204, 401, 473; subjunc. 222; mixed 330, 601; reported 519
- Corinth 86, 90

- dative: disadvantage 169; double 343, 359, 737; ethical 17, 774, 829; person judging 778; predicative 149, 193, 287, 859; thing valued 49; v. gen. 337
- delivery p. 18, p. 34, pp. 39–40; Don. on 43; gesture in 114, 122, 204; *see also* metre and delivery, mimicry
- diminutive 82, 143, 173, 177, 354
- divorce 155, 491, 638, 782
- Donatus, critical methods of 74, 83, 94, 101, 189, 378, 468, 482; *see also* Introduction 6
- dramatic conventions: (characters)
adulescens 132, 140, 282, 293; *matrona* 179, 201; *meretrix* p. 180, 59, 159; *servus* 335, (*currents*) pp. 13–14, p. 190, 359, 815; *socrus* 201; (staging) delayed encounter 81, 731; door opening 521; mirror scene p. 157; off-stage birth 318, 375; returning traveller 314, 353, 359, 456–7; *see also* formulae, stage business
- empty stage p. 115, p. 129, p. 165, p. 180; *see also* act divisions
- erus* 188, 430
- Euripides p. 10, p. 86, 14, 791
- exclamations: *aitai* 449; (*e*)*hem* 205, 339, 340, 347, 527; (*e*)*heu* 74; *eho* 719; *heus* 339, 523; *hui* 283; *vae* 605; acc. 74, 198; infin. 227, 645
- exposition: formal 76, 97, 176; limiting of 140, 824; names provided in 77, 179, 427; sources of 574; *see also* prologue, protatic characters, suspense
- exposure of children 400, 705, 818
- female speech 58, 70, 232, 455, 610, 824–9
- fides* 59, 109, 751
- figures: *ab initio ad finem* 240; anacoluthon 248, 287; asyndeton 65, 440–1; chiasm 127, 242, 475; *ἐπαγγελία* (promise) 208; *figura etymologica* 580, 594, 644; hyperbaton 274, 348, 369, 402, 593, 632; paronomasia 2, 19, 100, 168; prolepsis p. 29, 68, 71, 117, 189, 241, 280, 360, 580, 774; tmesis 58, 364
- formulae: asseveration 106, 207; entrance 246, 521; exclamation 324; exit 272; finale 880; greeting 353, 456–7, 853; impatience 523; imprecation 134; legal 870; leave-taking 196, 272, 725; *see also* dramatic conventions
- fors fortuna* 386, 610
- frequentative verbs p. 27, p. 31, 526, 743
- funeral games pp. 17–18; *see also* Aemilius Paullus
- genitive: obj. 88, 167, 219, 301, 404, 580; part. 15, 154, 234, 236, 284, 338, 357, 643; pred. 529; respect 121; rubric 97; source 129; value 513, 799
- geography, real v. fantasy 86, 171, 433
- gerund + acc. 45, 92, 254, 684; + gen. 372
- gesture, *see* delivery
- Gilbert, W. S. pp. 38–9
- gladiators p. 3, pp. 16–18, p. 25, 40, 797
- hetairai* 734, 861
- Horace p. 8, p. 34, p. 44
- humanum* 86, 214, 524, 553, 555
- Imbros p. 129, 86, 171, 260
- imperium* over children 244; *see also* patria potestas
- inceptive verbs: *commiscescor* 333; *commiserescor* 129; *euanescor* 13; *rescio* 190, 208, 262, 867
- indicative for subunc.: causal clauses 210, 419, 477, 619; conditions 330, 473; ind. quests. 273, 321, 351; limiting rel. 760; with *quam* 230, 300; with *quom* 230, 300, 475
- infinitive: exclamatory 227, 645; expressing purpose 189; fut. with indeclin. part. 629
- interjections: *eccum* 246, 352; *eho* 100, 267; *em* 63, 271; *heia* 250
- Iovialis 260, 633
- Leo, Friedrich p. 8, p. 13
- Lindsay, W. M. p. 46, p. 47, 134, 557, 629
- ludi Megalenses* p. 11, p. 15, p. 84, p. 87, 5
- Luscius Lanuvinus pp. 30–1, 47
- marriage customs 135, 139, 142, 493, 640, 666; represented in comedy 383, 714, 866; *see also* Athens, adultery, divorce
- masks pp. 127–8, p. 147, 74, 352
- Menander 86, 171, 175, 179, 555; and Apollodorus p. 204; dramaturgy of p. 141, p. 157, 148, 223, 232; *Aspis* 196; *Epitrepontes* pp. 204–7, 196, 831, 866; *Samia* p. 128, p. 141, p. 203, 576, 701–5
- metre and delivery: caesura 177, 779; coincidence of metrical and word boundaries 229; enjambment 2, 4, 203, 277, 717; prosodic features 120

- (apocope); 136, 161, 745 (diaeresis), 189 (elision), 85, 384, 745 (hiatus), 210 (prosodic hiatus), 28, 202, 347 (iambic shortening); rhythmic shifts 201, 516, 543; *see also* delivery
- mime 201, 620–1
- mimicry (of speech) 131, 148, 803
- misogyny 203, 207, 214, 225, 662; *see also* abuse
- monologue p. 141, p. 192, 563; 'link' p. 128, 335
- music, dramatic contribution of pp. 39–40, p. 180, 23; *see also* metre and delivery
- Myconos 86, 433, 440
- oaths 207; (*ede*)*pol* 58, 160, 786; *hercle* 416; *mecastor* 83; *pro* + noun 198
- opus est* p. 206, 104, 327
- orator* p. 3, 9, 10, 55
- Orcus 852, 875
- Pacuvius p. 45, 14, 129
- patronage: literary p. 3, p. 11, p. 85, 38, 52; of Bacchis 734, 747, 764
- parataxis p. 29, 123, 744
- Parmeno: as *currens* p. 14, 359; as untrustworthy narrator 179, 183, 322; personality of 76, 79, 113
- patria potestas* 121, 243, 250, 268, 494, 654
- pietas* 301, 306, 447, 492, 579, 589
- pregnancy in comedy p. 207, 318, 375; *see also* dramatic conventions, Appendix I
- prologues: of Pl. p. 4; of T. p. 3, p. 12, p. 23, pp. 86–7; delayed 196; suppressed p. 9, p. 19, 476, 574, 649, 824
- protatic characters p. 96, 97; *see also* exposition
- proverbs p. 41, 440, 619, 620–1 (?), 675, 696
- quin*: doubt 326, 728; generic clause 68, 240, 768; neg. purpose 27, 65; with *nequeo* 385; = *quominus* 127, 150
- rape 576, 601, 815; at a festival 592, 822; euphemisms for 376 (*facinus*), 383 (*uitium*), 572 (*comprimo*)
- recognition (*cognitio*) pp. 205–6, 831, 866; ring as token in 574, 812, 821, 829, 846
- rhetoric pp. 12–13, p. 16, pp. 42–3, 2, 51, 208, 215, 242, 576, 677; *see also* figures
- ring, *see* recognition
- Salus 338
- Scipio Aemilianus p. 10, p. 11, p. 17, p. 27, p. 31
- Shakespeare, William p. 4, p. 31, p. 46
- slave punishment 108, 773; *see also* abuse
- stage: business p. 185, 114, 316, 443, 786–93; space p. 147, p. 180, 863
- supine 104, 277, 296 (abl.); 77, 224, 528, 589 (acc.)
- suspense p. 19, p. 20, p. 141, p. 192, p. 193
- syncopated perf. 5, 84, 148, 251, 292, 519, 779, 796, 845
- tense selection 129, 131, 139, 222, 532, 545, 599, 827
- tenuis* p. 30
- theatre vocabulary: *ago* p. 84; *cognitio* 831; *doceo* 14; *exigo* 12; *placeo* p. 85; *sto* 15
- tibicen* p. 85, p. 128, p. 130, p. 150, 134, 242, 360, 515, 612; *see also* music
- tragedy p. 19, p. 157, p. 204, 129, 293, 449; parody of p. 10, 516, 521
- translation: by T. pp. 8–9, p. 12; by Pl. p. 9; *see also* Apollodorus
- Turpilius p. 30, 56
- Virgil pp. 26–8, p. 34, pp. 40–1, 172, 395
- vocative 134, 243, 256
- Volcacius Sedigitus 14
- women: extravagance of 225, 240; in audience 35; role in *Heu.* p. 6, pp. 21–2, p. 25, p. 128, p. 207, 564; *see also* female speech, misogyny

